

INTERNATIONAL HANDBOOKS TO THE
NEW TESTAMENT

Edited by ORELLO CONE, D.D. To be completed in four volumes.

- I. **The Synoptic Gospels.** By GEORGE L. CARY.
- II. **The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Thes-
salonians, etc.** By JAMES DRUMMOND.
- III. **Hebrews, Colossians, Ephesians, etc.** By ORELLO
CONE.
- IV. **The Fourth Gospel, Acts, etc.** By HENRY P.
FORBES. *In preparation.*

INTERNATIONAL HANDBOOKS
TO THE
NEW TESTAMENT

BY ORELLO CONE, D.D., EDITOR, GEORGE L. CARY, L.H.D.
JAMES DRUMMOND, LL.D., AND HENRY P. FORBES, D.D.

THE EPISTLES

TO THE

HEBREWS, COLOSSIANS, EPHESIANS, AND PHILEMON

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES, THE EPISTLES

OF JAMES, PETER, AND JUDE

TOGETHER WITH

A SKETCH OF THE HISTORY OF THE CANON

OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

BY

ORELLO CONE, D.D.

Professor of Biblical Theology in the Canton Theological School; author of
"Gospel Criticism and Historical Christianity," "The Gospel and
its Earliest Interpretations," "Paul: The Man, the
Missionary, and the Teacher," etc.



G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS
NEW YORK & LONDON
The Knickerbocker Press

1901

COPYRIGHT, 1901
BY
ORELLO CONE

The Knickerbocker Press, New York

GENERAL PREFACE TO THE SERIES.

THESE Handbooks constitute an exegetical series covering the entire New Testament and constructed on a plan which admits of greater freedom of treatment than is usual in commentaries proper. The space generally devoted in commentaries to a minute examination of the grammatical construction of passages of minor importance is occupied with the discussion of those of a special interest from a doctrinal and practical point of view. Questions of the authorship and date of the several books are treated in carefully-prepared Introductions, and numerous Dissertations are inserted elucidating matters of graver moment.

The books of the New Testament are treated as a literature which in order to be understood must be explained, like all other ancient literatures, in accordance with the accepted principles of the grammatical and historical interpretation. The aim of the writers has been to ascertain and clearly set forth the meaning of the authors of these books by the application of this method in freedom from dogmatic prepossessions.

The purpose has been constantly kept in view to furnish a series of Handbooks to the New Testament which should meet the wants of the general reader, and at the same time present the results of the latest scholarship and of the most thorough critical investigation.

Accordingly, more prominence has been given to the statement of the results of the critical processes than to the presentation of the details of these processes by means of extended discussions of questions of Greek grammar, philology, and exegesis. Hence, while the advanced student will find much to interest him in these volumes, it is believed that ministers who have not the time to occupy themselves with the refinements of minute hermeneutics, superintendents and teachers of Sunday-schools, and Bible-students in general will find them suited to their needs. The text used is that of the Revised Version, although for the purpose of saving space the text has not been printed, and the passages explained have been indicated in part by references only and in part by references together with a few initial words.

THE EDITOR.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.	
INTRODUCTION	I
EXPOSITION	10
THE DOCTRINAL TEACHINGS OF THE EPISTLE	79
THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.	
INTRODUCTION	85
EXPOSITION	91
THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.	
INTRODUCTION	123
EXPOSITION	133
SOME DOCTRINAL FEATURES OF COLOSSIANS AND EPHESIANS	178
THE EPISTLE TO PHILEMON.	
INTRODUCTION	183
EXPOSITION	185
THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.	
INTRODUCTION	189
EXPOSITION OF FIRST TIMOTHY	199
EXPOSITION OF SECOND TIMOTHY	235
EXPOSITION OF TITUS	253
SOME DOCTRINAL POINTS OF VIEW IN THE PASTORAL EPISTLES	263
THE EPISTLE OF JAMES	
INTRODUCTION	267
EXPOSITION	273

	PAGE
THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER.	
INTRODUCTION	297
EXPOSITION	303
THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER.	
INTRODUCTION	325
EXPOSITION	329
THE EPISTLE OF JUDE.	
INTRODUCTION	343
EXPOSITION	347
A SKETCH OF THE HISTORY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CANON	353

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

INTRODUCTION.

THE argument of the Epistle is constructed somewhat loosely, but is fairly clear. The writer declares in the first section of the Epistle (i.-iv. 13) the superiority of Christianity to the religion of the Old Testament, proceeding upon the assumption of a revelation through Christ from God, who had formerly spoken "in the prophets." The proof of the exaltation of Christ above the "angels" is drawn from various passages in the Psalms, which are made to serve the author's purpose by means of a method of interpretation current in his time among Christian writers. The latter part of this section contains exhortations to the readers to beware of hardness of heart and unbelief, lest they come short of entering into the "rest" prepared for the faithful and obedient (iii. 12-iv. 13). The second division (iv. 14-x. 18) contains the doctrinal theme of the Epistle, which, as a special application of the general principle of the greater excellence of the new dispensation in comparison with the old, consists in the teaching that Christ is the true high-priest, who, appointed by God, perfected through suffering, and exalted to heaven, has become the author of "everlasting salvation." In a digression (v. 10-vi. 20) the writer expresses the regret that his readers are "dull of hearing" and "babes" in respect to spiritual things, "having need of milk" and not of "solid food," since his doctrine of the

high-priesthood of Christ contains matters "hard of interpretation"; and he exhorts them to leave "the first principles of Christ and press on to perfection," not founding on "the teaching of baptisms and of laying on of hands and of resurrection of the dead and of eternal judgment," lest they be guilty of apostasy, from which "it is impossible to renew them again unto repentance." But he is persuaded of better things for them, and desires that they be diligent and "imitators of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises." They have, indeed, by reason of the "oath" of God a hope which is "as an anchor of the soul, both sure and stedfast and entering into that which is within the veil; whither as a forerunner Jesus entered in for us, having become a high-priest forever after the order of Melchisedeck." This high-priest, the writer now proceeds to show (vii.-x.), is superior to the priesthood under the law, which must have many priests because of their mortality. He is "holy, guileless, undefiled, separated from sinners, and made higher than the heavens." He does not need, "like those high-priests," to "offer up sacrifices daily first for his own sins and then for the sins of the people," but he "abideth forever," "hath an unchangeable priesthood," and "is able to save to the uttermost." He entered not into an earthly tabernacle, but "into heaven itself, now to appear before the face of God for us," and his priesthood was not "through the blood of goats and calves, but through his own blood," whereby he has "obtained eternal redemption." In the third and concluding part of the Epistle (x. 19-xiii. 21) the readers are admonished to be faithful, to hold fast the confession of their hope, for if they sin wilfully after having had a knowledge of the truth, "there remaineth no more a sacrifice for sins." Faith, which is declared to be "the assurance of things hoped for, the proving of things not seen," is illustrated by examples from the Old Testament, and the readers are exhorted to stand firm in their tribula-

tions, which are to be regarded as chastenings whereby the heavenly Father seals them as His children.

The Epistle had a scanty and somewhat doubtful recognition in the early Church. Clement of Rome, who wrote at the end of the first century or the beginning of the second, makes a liberal use of its ideas and expressions, without, however, making mention of it. It had no standing in the earliest use of New Testament writings as an authority, only traces of it are found in Justin Martyr,¹ but none in the existing writings of Irenæus, and Tertullian evidently did not regard it as having apostolical authority. Marcion did not recognise it, and it is not accepted in the Canon of Muratori, a list of received New Testament books made by an unknown writer toward the end of the second century. It was not until the time of Jerome and Augustine that it came gradually to be recognised as canonical,—that is, as constituting a part of the sacred writings called the New Testament. It fared better, however, in the eastern Church, where we find Clement of Alexandria at the end of the second century quoting it as a work of Paul's, and appealing to the authority of his teacher Pantænus. But both find it difficult to account for the absence of the words, "Paul, the apostle," etc., at the beginning of the Epistle. Origen regarded the contents as Pauline, but the form as that of some disciple of the apostle's. "Who really wrote it," he says, "God only knows." In the Syriac translation of the New Testament, known as the Peshito, it stands after the thirteen Epistles ascribed to Paul. Eusebius wavers as to the standing of the Epistle, now mentioning it as disputed and again as canonical. The opinion of the eastern Church finally prevailed in the west, though Jerome and Augustine were cognisant of the fact that some disputed its genuineness. The reformers generally rejected it, and the consensus of modern scholarship is almost unanimously against its Pauline

¹ About A.D. 150.

authorship. It is in opposition to this consensus that the revised version of the New Testament entitles it, "The Epistle of Paul to the Hebrews" ! With respect to the relation of the Epistle to other New Testament writings, it does not appear that the author was at all influenced by the four Gospels. He may have been acquainted with Acts, and certainly was familiar with a considerable number of Paul's Epistles, notably with Romans, 1 Corinthians, and Galatians.

The Epistle is without address, and who the original readers were is accordingly a matter of conjecture. The superscription, "To the Hebrews," has no significance in this relation, since we do not know by whom it was prefixed. That it was not intended to be a general Epistle either to Jews or others is apparent from the references to individual and local circumstances in such passages as v. 11, 12, and x. 25, 32-36. Against the supposition that it was addressed to the Jewish-Christian community in Jerusalem it has been urged that the Epistle, which is not a translation from the Hebrew, is written in very good Greek ; that its arguments based on the Old Testament are drawn from the Greek translation known as the Septuagint, while the passages so quoted often denote a wide departure from the original ; and that a Church which is historically known to have been an object of charity cannot have been said to have ministered and still to be ministering to the saints (ii. 3). The writing may have been addressed to Jewish Christians in Alexandria or to the mixed Jewish and gentile Christian community in Rome. The reference to persecutions fits the latter place rather than either of the others, and iii. 12 can hardly have been applicable to Jewish Christians in any locality. It is evident that no exact determination of the address of the Epistle is possible. Its object is involved in the obscurity which surrounds the address. It is clear that the writer's object in general was to warn his readers against apostasy from the Christian faith. But it is uncertain into what

former condition he conceived the lapse to be. Those who think the Epistle was addressed to Jewish-Christian readers read in it a warning against an apostasy from Christianity to Judaism. The writer's attempt to show the superiority of Christianity to the Jewish religion appears to favour this view, but the admonition in reference to "falling away from the living God" is appropriate only to a lapse into heathenism. The exhortation to leave, as the first principles of Christian instruction, faith in God, the teaching of the resurrection of the dead and of eternal judgment (vi. 1-3), is inapplicable to Jewish Christians to whom these Jewish doctrines were familiar before their conversion to Christianity, but addressed to converts from heathenism it is intelligible and fitting.

The traditional Pauline authorship is entirely without support in the Epistle itself, and it has already been shown not to have historical evidence in its favour. The apostle who claimed to have his gospel without the testimony of men¹ could not have written Heb. ii. 3. The Greek style is not that of Paul, and it was on the recognition of this fact, noted by Clement of Alexandria and Origen, that the supposition of a translation from a Hebrew original was founded. The writer's manner of quoting from the Old Testament is different from that of Paul. He quotes accurately from the Septuagint, while Paul generally quotes from memory. He appears to have been ignorant of Hebrew, with which Paul was acquainted, and bases some of his arguments upon inaccuracies in the Septuagint translation.² The doctrinal teaching of the Epistle is not that of Paul. While the writer has some points of contact with the apostle's teachings, his deviations from them are marked, and his point of view is quite different from that of his great predecessor. The Pauline conceptions of the law, of faith,

¹ Gal. i. 1, 11, 12, 15, 16, ii. 6; 1 Cor. ix. 11, 23.

² See x. 5-7, compared with Ps. xl. 67.

and of the atonement of Christ are apparently foreign to him. To the resurrection of Christ, which was the fundamental doctrine of the apostle, he barely alludes, and he seems to have no comprehension of Paul's mystic thought of justification by faith. He manifests no interest in Paul's great teaching that the gospel was destined for the gentiles as well as for the Jews. He goes far beyond the apostle in the unwarrantable typical and allegorical interpretation of the Old Testament. Various conjectures as to the authorship have been made by different investigators, but no convincing reasons can be urged in support of any one of them. That of Luther in favour of Apollos has been accepted by many. Whoever the author may have been, he was certainly a man of intellectual force and originality. While he was acquainted with Paul's thought and influenced by it, he was not an imitator of the great apostle. His fine Greek style, his disregard if not ignorance of the Hebrew Old Testament, and his ignorance of the affairs of the temple and the priesthood indicate that he was not a resident of Palestine. In education and sympathy he appears to have been closely in touch with the Alexandrian philosophy and familiar with the thought of Philo.¹

There can be no doubt that the Epistle belongs to a period later than the so-called apostolic age. The writer's acquaintance with the Epistles of Paul presupposes their existence in a collection and their use in the churches for religious

¹ Harnack (*Zeitschrift für die neutest. Wissenschaft*, 1900, Heft 1) has presented under the title, "Probabilia über die Adresse und den Verfasser des Hebräerbriefs," an ingenious defence of the hypothesis that the Epistle was produced by the joint authorship of Aquila and Priscilla, with the latter in the leading part. Our space does not admit of a discussion of this conjecture, the support of which must necessarily be very slender. "Probabilia" is rather too strong a word to apply to that part of the article that treats of the authorship of the Epistle, which is a work too strongly theological to be the production of a woman.

instruction — a state of things which could not have been possible until a considerable time after the death of the apostle. The reference to persecutions already undergone by the readers (x. 32, 33) finds its most probable explanation in the barbarities suffered under Nero, and the present tribulations (xii. 1-10) may be those of the time of Domitian. The use of the present tense in reference to the temple and its services does not necessarily imply that it was still in existence, as is shown by the usage of writers unquestionably later. The precise time of the composition of the Epistle is indeterminable, but it was probably between A.D. 80 and 90.

The Epistle shows in many respects the contact of the writer with the Alexandrian philosophy represented in the works of Philo, although evidence is wanting of an intimate and extended acquaintance on his part with the writings of this philosopher. The "spiritual atmosphere" of the two is, however, to a considerable degree the same. The allegorical interpretation of the Old Testament in the Epistle is essentially that of Philo, particularly in reference to Melchizedek.¹ Philo regards this personage as a type of the Logos, and the author of Hebrews sees in him a type of Christ, developing the parallel in almost the very words employed by the former. The reference to the daily sacrifice of the high-priest² and to his entering into the holy of holies once every year,³ which is not in accordance with the Old Testament ritual, corresponds with statements in Philo. In x. 3 the very words of Philo are employed, "remembrance of sins," in reference to sacrifices in general. Philo, however, had in mind the sacrifices of the impious and profane. In the passage referring to the oath of God⁴ the writer follows Philo very closely, quoting the same passage that he quotes from the Old Testament and expressing the same idea regarding the necessity of God's swearing by

¹ vii. 1-3.

² vii. 27.

³ ix. 7.

⁴ vi. 13, 14.

Himself, since there was nothing greater by which He could swear. That the writer entertained Philo's extreme idea of the inspiration of the Old Testament is evident from his following him in his manner of quoting from that literature. Like Philo he finds in every passage in the Old Testament the veritable word of God, even when in the original the writer is speaking about God.¹ In this respect he differs from Paul. Moreover, he shows unmistakably the influence of the Alexandrian conception of the metaphysical opposition of idea and appearance or phenomenon, the heavenly and the earthly, type and antitype. The whole creation is conceived as composed of the invisible world of heavenly types² and a visible world,³ the two corresponding to Philo's world of ideas and sensible world. Accordingly, the earthly sanctuary⁴ and all that pertains to it is regarded as an antitype of the heavenly model.⁵ To the upper, ideal world alone belongs permanence. Although the writer does not apply the term Logos to Christ, his Christology is manifestly based upon the Philonic doctrine of the Logos. Like Philo's Logos, Christ is the preëxistent agent of creation and the supporter of the world.⁶ We evidently have here the transition in the development of New Testament Christology from Paulinism to the doctrine of the fourth Gospel.⁷

One cannot attentively consider the argument of the Epistle without becoming aware of the chasm which separates the religious conceptions of the writer from the enlightened Christian thought of the present time. His ideas of Christ and his manner of proving the superiority of Christian salvation to Judaism are altogether foreign to our religious philosophy. His remoteness from us is due to the influence

¹ i. 7, iv. 4, 7, vii. 21, x. 30.

² viii. 5, ix. 23.

³ xi. 3.

⁴ ix. I.

⁵ ix. 24.

⁶ i. 2, io, iii. 3.

⁷ See *The Gospel and its Earliest Interpretations*, by the author of this volume.

upon his thinking exerted by Jewish theology, ritual, and legend. An advance beyond his point of view is possible only to those who have thrown aside these encumbrances. The paradox of the progress beyond the singular conceptions of this Epistle is that it is a return to the simplicity of Jesus.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

EXPOSITION.

The first section (i.-iv. 13) is of the nature of an introduction leading up to the discussion of the chief theme of the Epistle, and consists of two principal parts: (1) An announcement of the revelation through Christ and a declaration of his exalted work with proofs from the Old Testament and an application by way of exhortation (i.-ii. 4); (2) Further elaboration of the proposition of the exaltation of Christ and a statement of the theme, his high-priesthood (ii. 5-18), together with an elaboration of its significance (iii.-iv. 13).

The declaration that God spoke *to the fathers in the prophets* (i. 1) is grounded upon the doctrine current among the Jews and early Christians that the Old Testament writers were immediately inspired by God, or that God "spoke" through them to men. It is characteristic of our author that in quoting from the Old Testament he employs the formula, "He saith," instead of Paul's expression "it is written" or "the Scripture saith."¹ After the manner of Philo, *the prophets* represent all the writers of the Old Testament. *By divers portions* means at different times, and *in divers manners* expresses the diversity of the contents and form of the communications.

At the end of these days (i. 2) is an expression for the time immediately preceding the Messianic age, that is, the present æon as contrasted with the æon to come, and involves the conception current in the early Church of two great world-

¹ See i. 6, 7, iv. 3, 4, viii. 8.

periods—the pre-Messianic and the Messianic.¹ The Christians at the time of the writer lived in expectation of the second coming of Christ in glory and power (the Parousia) to establish his kingdom on the earth. The time before that event, the period in which they were then living, was called “the present age,” while “the age to come” designated the period to be introduced by the second advent of the Messiah. See ix. 26 and 1 Cor. x. 11; Luke xviii. 30, xx. 35. The word for “age”² is sometimes translated “world.”

Hath spoken to us in His Son (i. 2), literally, *a Son*. But the writer is not satisfied with this simple designation which he employs also elsewhere (iii. 6, v. 8, vii. 28), and amplifies with the epithet “of God” in iv. 14, vi. 6, vii. 3, x. 29. He proceeds in a way impossible to a Jewish Christian and surpassing the boldest flights of Paul to exalt Jesus as the pre-existent agent of creation, the “effulgence” of the divine glory, the very “image” of God, and the upholder of all things (v. 3). In speaking of Jesus as Son he evidently employs the word in a sense which he would not regard as applicable to men, whose sonship in relation to God is implied in xii. 7–11. The declaration that Christ was *appointed heir of all things* probably refers to him as the preëxistent Son who according to Paul was clothed with divine glory and splendour prior to his appearance on the earth.³ *Appointed* does not refer, as some suppose, to the rank assigned to Jesus at the end of his earthly career, his resurrection, but to the position of dignity and glory which was decreed to him as the preëxistent Son. As *heir of all things* he is designated as the future possessor and ruler of the world in the creation of which he was the agent of God. The idea of the preëxistence of Christ is Pauline,⁴ but the form of

¹ ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος, this age; αἰὼν μέλλων, the age to come. Weber, *Jüd. Theol.*, p. 371. ² αἰών. ³ Phil. ii. 6.

⁴ 1 Cor. viii. 6, x. 4, xv. 47; 2 Cor. viii. 9; Phil. ii. 6; cf. Col. i. 15 ff.

expression has been influenced by Philo's speculations concerning the Logos.

By whom also He made the worlds (i. 2), literally "the ages," that is, all things existing in time. This is a stronger expression than that of Paul, "through whom are all things."¹ The influence of Philo's speculations upon the author is manifest here. Philo taught that the world was made through the Logos, the first born Son of God. In Hebrews are observable the first steps in the process of transferring to the person Jesus Philo's idea of the Logos as an intermediary between God and the world, "the shadow of God, whom using as an organ, He made the world." The conception is fully developed in the fourth Gospel.

The effulgence of His glory and the very image of His substance (i. 3).—The word rendered "effulgence" means a reflected splendour. In Christ, a derived being separate from God, the divine glory is manifested to a degree which renders him essentially like the Deity. "Refulgence" is probably a better rendering. In other words, he is "*the very image of His substance*," or person, that is, partakes of the divine nature, which has been *stamped* upon him, as a seal impresses wax. That this is a purely speculative opinion of the writer's is evident when we consider that in the really historical records of the sayings of Jesus, the first three Gospels, the great Teacher, the Son of Man, nowhere gives such an idea of his person. The terms rendered "refulgence" and "image" are derived from the Alexandrian writers, and are not elsewhere found in the New Testament. The fourth evangelist's notion of the Logos as God and his words attributed to Jesus that he that had seen him had seen the Father are a further development of the same doctrine.

All things (i. 3) means all created things, the things which were made through the Son. All-sustaining or almighty power is here ascribed to Jesus with reference probably to

¹ 1 Cor. viii. 6.

his preëxistent state and his state of exaltation, when, having *made purification of sins*, he *sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high*. After his earthly atoning work he assumes the position of the highest honour and a participation in the government of the world¹ which belonged to him as the "appointed," preëxistent "heir."

In i. 4-14, the writer lays down and attempts to support the thesis that Christ became so much better than the angels as he had inherited a more excellent name than they.

He *became so much better than the angels* (i. 4) by reason of his completion of the work of redemption and his exaltation to the right hand of God. During his earthly life the author conceives that he was "for a little while" (ii. 9) made lower than the angels. That he believed Jesus in his preëxistent state to have been superior to the angels is evident from the reference to his "more excellent name," that is, Son of God. It should be noted here that the writer's entire speculation about the relation of Jesus to angels has no other basis than the notion of the Hebrew mythology and cosmology respecting these super-mundane beings who were fancied to occupy a region above the earth called heaven. He now proceeds to furnish a proof of his thesis by quotations from the Old Testament. The first passage quoted

Thou art my Son (i. 5), etc., is from Ps. ii. 7, and refers in the original to an Israelitish king, perhaps Solomon. *This day have I begotten thee* undoubtedly refers to the generation of the Son before the beginning of time, since Christ existed before the creation according to the writer's conception, and by him God "made the worlds." The word *σήμερον*, to-day, is also used by Philo in reference to time antedating the creation or to eternity (see the discussion of doctrine at the end of the Commentary on the Epistle). The reference of the words to Jesus is unwarranted, and the writer adopts a

¹ See Ps. cx. 1.

method of interpreting the Old Testament current in the early Church,¹ and unhappily followed by too many in modern times. The second passage, *I will be to him a Father*, etc., is from 2 Sam. vii. 14, and refers to Solomon. In order to show from the Old Testament that the angels are required to worship Jesus, the writer quotes from Ps. xcvi. 7,² which reads in the Septuagint, or Greek translation, *Worship him, all ye his angels*. But the being whom the angels according to this version are called upon to worship is Jehovah. The reference to Jesus is a gross perversion of the original meaning of the passage, which has no relation to Christ's coming into the world.

Bringeth the first-born into the world (i. 6).—Probably *again bringeth into the world* refers to the second coming of Christ in glory.

Again must be construed with *bringeth into*. The inferiority of the angels to Christ is shown by a citation from Ps. civ. 4 (i. 7). They are only servants, and are changeable and perishable, while the Son remains forever.

Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever (i. 8, 9).—This passage is from Ps. xlv. 6, 7, which is a wedding-song composed with reference to a king who is extravagantly addressed as "god," according to the oriental conception of kings as sons of God. The reference of the epithet to Christ is in accord with the exalted idea of him entertained by the writer of the Epistle. Philo also regarded the Logos as God in the sense that he was a divine energy or instrument.

Above thy fellows (i. 9) refers in the Psalm to fellow-kings. It is doubtful whom the writer had in mind in referring the passage to Christ, unless it were the angels.

Thou, Lord, in the beginning (i. 10-12).—This quotation is from Ps. cii. 25-27, probably a post-exilic composition in which God is addressed in a strain of lamentation. Our author, who quoted from the Septuagint, found "Lord,"

¹ Acts xiii. 33.

² See also Deut. xxxii. 43.

which is not in the Hebrew, and as this was a term applied by the Christians to Jesus, he was led to refer the passage to him in accordance with verse 2.

Sit thou on my right hand (i. 13, 14).—From Ps. cx. 1, an ode addressed to a king by an unknown writer. This Psalm passes in the first three Gospels as David's, and the passage in question as referring to Christ.¹ It was interpreted as Messianic by many of the Jewish scholars. Our author in his use of it followed the tradition current in his time, which was based upon an error as to the authorship of the Psalm and a false method of interpreting the Old Testament.

Ministring spirits sent forth (i. 14).—All the angels are conceived as ministring *for the sake of those who shall inherit salvation*, that is, the everlasting salvation of the Messianic kingdom. Mere "deliverance from evil" is too weak, and is not in accord with apostolic doctrine.

In ii. 1-4, the writer makes an application of the teaching of chapter i. to the spiritual needs of his readers, exhorting them to give earnest heed to the things that were heard.

Since, he concludes, Christ, a being so exalted above the angels and holding the rank of the Son of God, has communicated to us this gospel of the new dispensation, we ought so much the more to give earnest heed to the things that we have heard, that is, to the saving truth taught by Jesus and his disciples. For it is only through the constant holding of our minds to these things that we can escape the peril of *drifting away from them*. This is the first expression of the writer's solicitude about the apostasy of the church or churches to which the Epistle was addressed, and in the exhortation with which this chapter opens appears his chief object in writing to them.

For if the word spoken through angels (ii. 2).—By the argument from the less to the greater the writer proceeds to

¹ Matt. xxii. 44; Mark xii. 36; Luke xx. 42.

establish the preceding warning and exhortation. If disobedience to the requirements of the word given through angels, who have already been shown to be inferior to Christ, was visited with punishment, how much more will it be perilous to neglect the greater salvation offered in the New Covenant! The idea that the law was given *through angels* has no other foundation than a Jewish tradition. There is a hint of it in the Septuagint version of Deut. xxxiii. 2, which is an erroneous translation of the Hebrew text. Paul and the writer of Acts have given currency to this tradition,¹ but it is of no importance for our instruction.

The salvation announced *through the Lord* (ii. 3), that is, Christ, for whom "Lord" was a current designation in the early Church, was *confirmed* to the writer and his readers by those who had heard Jesus. This acknowledgment of second-hand information could not have been made by Paul.²

God also bearing witness (ii. 4).—The writer evidently believed with his contemporaries that the spiritual phenomena of the apostolic age were attributable to a special divine intervention manifested in so-called gifts of the Holy Spirit and by *signs and wonders* and miracle-working *powers*. The worth of his testimony depends, of course, upon the sources of his information, of which we know nothing, upon the answer to the question whether or no he had ever given the phenomena a careful critical investigation, and upon his point of view respecting nature and the supernatural. Our ignorance of these matters renders it hazardous for us to accept his judgment as decisive in the case.

Throughout the remainder of this chapter (ii. 5-18) the writer continues the discussion of the thesis that Christ was superior to the angels, shows the necessity of his death, and reaches finally the central theme of the Epistle, his high-priesthood.

The superiority in question is shown in the fact that *the world to come* (ii. 5), that is, the Messianic age, the time-

¹ Gal. iii. 19; Acts vii. 53.

² Gal. i. 12.

period after the second coming of Christ including its economy, was not *subjected to angels* but to Christ. This proposition the writer undertakes after his manner to establish by a passage from Ps. viii. 4-6. The supposed proof from Scripture is, however, entirely invalid, since the Psalm has reference only to man in general and not at all to any particular person. The writer was probably misled in his interpretation by the term "son of man" in the passage, which is Jesus' self-designation in the first three Gospels. The contention of Dean Alford and others that the author of the Epistle did not interpret this "non-Messianic Psalm" in a "Messianic sense," but referred the passage to man under the new dispensation, is futile, for the entire argument is pointless if it does not relate to the preëminence of Christ in contrast with the angels. Paul is chargeable with a similar misinterpretation in 1 Cor. xv. 27.

In the words, *thou crownedst him with glory and honour*, etc. (ii. 7), the writer continues his misinterpretation of the Old Testament passage in understanding man in general to refer to Christ, misled by the term "son of man" in verse 6. Only for a little while was Christ made lower than the angels, that is, during the time of his incarnation. The author follows the Septuagint, which renders the original Hebrew, "a little less than God," by "a little lower than the angels"; but he changes the "little," which in the Septuagint evidently expresses degree, into "for a short time"—a sense which his argument plainly requires.

But now we see not yet all things subjected to him (ii. 8).—The fact that the subjection of all things to Christ is not yet accomplished does not contradict the immediately preceding general declaration; for the complete subjection will take place only in the age to come, when he shall have returned in glory according to the ardent expectation of the time.

Christ is, however, the writer conceives, already, as if preparatory to this dominion, *crowned with glory and honour*

(ii. 9), that is, exalted to the right hand of God (i. 3) *because of the suffering of death*. The dutiful fulfilment of his earthly mission is regarded as a reason for the exaltation of Jesus. This hardly accords, however, with his having been originally the brightness of the divine glory and the express image of the divine substance, the appointed heir of all things (i. 2, 3). Perhaps the writer conceived that the lowly service of Jesus could add "glory and honour" even to so exalted a being as the preëxistent Son. Yet there is an incongruity in the idea that such a one should be "made perfect through sufferings," as if he lacked something which could be acquired by a human experience.

Made a little lower than the angels (ii. 9).—The correct rendering is "a little while lower." The idea of time, not of degree, was in the writer's mind, though the latter was that of the psalmist quoted. The subordination was, of course, during his abode upon the earth, and is contrasted with his supposed preëxistent state.

That by the grace of God he should taste of death for every man (ii. 9).—The mission of Christ for the salvation of the world is conceived as due to the grace of God, that is, His good-will and merciful kindness. This clause is probably to be connected with the words "the suffering of death." In declaring that Christ's death was "for" (in behalf of) every man the writer expresses the Pauline doctrine of the universality of the Saviour's mission. It does not appear, however, that he adopted in detail the apostle's teaching regarding Jesus' relation to the salvation of men, although, like Paul, he does not regard a universal atonement as implying universal salvation.

Perfect through sufferings (ii. 10).—It was fitting in God to make Jesus what he should be for the accomplishment of his mission by subjecting him to suffering. This cannot refer to the *crowning with glory and honour* (v. 9), where reward is the prominent thought, but to an inner ethical per-

fection, as in chapter v. 8 : " Learned obedience by what he suffered." Christ partook of human nature, and endured the sufferings incident to his mission in this condition because both *He that sanctifieth and they that are sanctified* (ii. 11) are of one origin, or from God, and are brethren.

The proofs from Scripture (ii. 12, 13) are from Ps. xxii. 22 in which the psalmist is speaking of himself, and from Is. viii. 17, 18, according to the Septuagint, where the prophet also refers to himself. On the assumption that the words from Isaiah are spoken by Christ, the writer finds in the expression of trust in God an evidence of the humanity of Jesus, and an intimation of the same in *I and the children*, that is, children of God, or other men. This may be regarded as the author's philosophy of the " incarnation," his *rationale* of Jesus' assumption of human nature. The argument would be as effective in favour of the entire humanity of Jesus as it is for his thesis. His proofs from the Old Testament are as usual groundless and unusually far-fetched. If he was Apollos, he here justifies the opinion, formed, of course, from the point of view of his age regarding interpretation, that he was " mighty in the Scriptures." ¹

The argument is carried on to the effect that Jesus must assume flesh and blood, become mortal, in order that he might die for the redemption of men.

In like manner partook of flesh and blood (ii. 14).—This goes beyond Paul, who could bring himself to say only that Christ was made " in the *likeness* of sinful flesh," ² and who was too logical to declare that the preëxistent glorious Son of God partook of flesh and blood *in the same way as men*. But our author is carried away by the impetus of his argument in making this declaration and in saying in the immediate connection (v. 17) that Jesus was *made in all things like unto his brethren*. How he would have reconciled this radical humanitarianism with his doctrine that Christ was

¹ Acts xviii. 24.

² Rom. viii. 3.

“ the very image ” of the divine person we can only conjecture.

The argument reaches its culmination in the teaching that through death Jesus brought *to naught him that hath the power of death, that is, the devil* (ii. 14). The author evidently held the doctrine of Paul that sin entails death, the great terror of which was not the dissolution of the body, but the deprivation of the resurrection at the coming of Christ and the hopeless tarrying in the underworld of all who while living did not receive him through faith. Since in the popular mythology the devil was supposed to be seducer of men to sin, he is conceived to have “ the power of death.” The writer of the Epistle does not, however, apprehend the death of Christ after the manner of Paul as the bearing of the curse of the law and the deliverance of men from it, but as the destruction of the devil. But we miss here what we find in Paul, an attempt at least to show how this result is conceived to be effected.

The manner in which the writer speaks of the entrance of Jesus into the world reminds us of Rom. i. 3, viii. 3. Like the apostle, however, he manifests little interest in the events of the earthly life of Jesus, and does not appear to have been familiar with the Gospel history. It is altogether a remarkable fact that the epistolary literature of the New Testament shows little contact with or regard for the events recorded in the Gospels. In Paul's letters the death and resurrection are almost the only facts of Jesus' career that are mentioned, and here it is the latter that lends significance to the former. The apostle's interest in the Founder of Christianity was chiefly dogmatic, and relates to the appearance on the earth in order to prepare the way for the Messianic kingdom, to the agony and the subsequent triumph and to the exaltation to heaven whence will be a speedy, glorious coming for the definite establishment of this kingdom. For all that lies between the birth “ of the seed of David according to the flesh ” and the celestial existence in glory, along with the two events that conditioned it, little interest is shown. Whatever acquaintance he may have had with the life of Jesus,¹ it is evident that the details that he

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 5, 7, xi. 23 f.

knew had no importance for him with respect to Christian faith, and that he laid no stress upon the example of his Master apart from the few conspicuous events previously mentioned. The man Jesus has almost no place in his thought, while the official designations, "Lord," "Christ," "Jesus Christ," "Lord Jesus Christ," and "Christ Jesus" perpetually occur. Although Hebrews was written at a time when at least the earliest of the first three Gospels was in existence, its attitude toward the historical Jesus is similar to that of Paul. The writer's designation of the person of Jesus differs from Paul's, "Lord" alone occurring only once against the latter's use of it 130 times, and "Christ" alone 3 times against 180 times in Paul's Epistles, while "Jesus" is most frequently used. But the personality chiefly in view is the exalted heavenly high-priest, who was on earth only that he might be qualified for this celestial function. The declarations regarding the sinlessness of Jesus are dogmatically conceived rather than referred to as biographical data,¹ and the descent from Juda (vii. 14) is referred to Num. xxiv. 27, rather than to the Gospel history. See on this subject von Soden's article in *Theologische Abhandlungen Carl von Weizsäcker gewidmet*, 1892.

In saying that the work of Jesus does not *take hold of angels* (ii. 16) the writer is in conflict with the author of Colossians (see i. 20 of that Epistle). He appears to have reasoned that as the Saviour of angelic beings Jesus would not have needed to become mortal.

But he taketh hold of the seed of Abraham (ii. 16).—Paul could not have expressed this limitation of the work of Christ. If in ii. 10 the writer's real conviction is declared in the words "taste death for every man," he must here have written "seed of Abraham" by inadvertence or have employed the species for the genus.

The theme of the Epistle is now announced for the first time in the words, *that he might be a merciful and faithful high-priest in things pertaining to God to make propitiation for the sins of the people* (ii. 17).—The further development of the idea proceeds from iv. 14. *To make propitiation* is to render God gracious, to placate Him by the offering of a

¹ iv. 15, vii. 26, ix. 14.

sacrifice in satisfaction for sin, the life of the victim for that of the people.

Suffered being tempted (ii. 18).—Christ's ability to succour the tempted is derived from his own suffering of temptation. Nothing could be more remote than this idea from the thought of Paul, who never recognised Jesus as undergoing temptation. The conception of the saving work of Christ as dependent upon or derived from his participation in a human struggle with sinful tendencies or an attainment of perfection by means of suffering (ii. 10, iv. 15) would have been unthinkable to the apostle from the point of view of his Christology.

The theme is here abandoned for a time, and the writer proceeds to show the superiority of Christ to Moses. Practical conclusions and exhortations are added (iii. 1.-iv. 13).

Wherefore, that is, on account of the preceding delineation of the character of Christ. *Partakers of a heavenly calling* (iii. 1). The readers, spiritual "brethren" of the writer, are addressed as persons who by reason of their Christian belief are of those "called" by Christ to be partakers of the Messianic kingdom when he shall establish it at his second coming. This call is designated as *heavenly* because supposed to come from heaven, where Christ was believed to be "at the right hand of God." The Pauline term "election" (ἐκλογή) is not used in the Epistle, but "calling" is its equivalent.

Apostle and high-priest of our confession (iii. 1).—One sent as high-priest to be the central object of our confession of faith.¹

Faithful to Him who appointed him (iii. 2).—Probably "made," that is, created him in the sense of being the Author of his being, is more correct than *appointed* to the office of high-priest.

¹ This distinctive feature of the Christology of the Epistle is foreign to Paul, just as his "second Adam" is to our author.

As Moses was *faithful* in all God's house,¹ so was Christ, whose superiority to Moses is declared in the affirmation that he who established (preferable to built) the house is greater than a servant in it (iii. 3-6). The *house* of God, that is, the religious economy of the Old Testament, in which Moses was only a servant, is conceived as "established" by Christ in his preëxistent activity, just as he was the agent of the creation (i. 2). So Philo regarded the Logos as the organ through whom the world was "established" or prepared.

Afterward to be spoken (iii. 5), that is, the law.

As a Son over His house, whose house are we (iii. 6).—The superiority of Christ over Moses is indicated by *Son* as contrasted with *servant* and by *over* as opposed to *in*. This house of God is represented as still existing in the Christian dispensation and as composed of the believers in Christ who hold fast their joyful confidence in his sure coming again in his kingdom.

Wherefore, even as the Holy Ghost saith (iii. 7).—Because you are God's house, or because you have so great a high-priest. The admonition which follows is based on Ps. xcvi. 7-11, which is quoted as the word of the Holy Ghost. The expression, "the Holy Ghost says," is again employed in x. 15, but not elsewhere in the New Testament. It is a designation of the prophetic Spirit of God who, in the Jewish and Christian belief of the time, was regarded as the inspirer of the Old Testament writers.

So I swear in my wrath (iii. 11).—God's oath! Compare Jesus' injunction, "Swear not at all." In ascribing *wrath* to God the writer is in accord with other New Testament writers. In the Gospels it is an evil to be fled from. In the Pauline theology it is expressed in the remorseless operation of the law, and it is Christ who saves men from it, so far as through faith they are justified by his blood.²

The readers are now admonished to beware lest they fall

¹ Num. xii. 7.

² 1 Thess. i. 10; Rom. v. 9.

away through *an evil heart of unbelief* as did the Israelites in the wilderness (iii. 12). The precise character of the apostasy referred to is not indicated, and is in fact not determinable by any data that we have. Whether the falling away was conceived as into Judaism or heathenism depends upon the address of the Epistle, which we have found to be uncertain (see Introduction).

As long as it is called to-day (iii. 13).—To-day includes “the present age,” or the time from the advent of Christ to his second coming which would usher in “the age to come,” the to-morrow, the second great world-period.

Accordingly, the condition of being *partakers of Christ* is conceived to be the *holding fast of confidence firm unto the end* (iii. 14).—The writer had no hope that he or his readers would share in the joy and glory of the Messianic kingdom to be set up by Christ at his second coming, unless they remained faithful until the time of that coming, that is, *unto the end*.

The following section (iii. 15-19) must be read as a whole without close dependence on the preceding. The sense probably is: When it is said, *To-day if ye shall hear*, etc., *who* (I ask) *when they heard did provoke*, etc. As the Israelites were not permitted because of unbelief to enter the promised land, so we, if we are unfaithful, shall have no part in the rest and peace of the Messianic kingdom soon to come.

The admonition to the readers is continued to beware, the promise still holding good that they may partake of the Messianic rest, lest they come short of the offered salvation through the apostasy to which he sees them to be inclined (iv. 1-13).

A promise being left (iv. 1).—The promise is regarded as holding until the time of its fulfilment, that is, until the second coming of Christ to establish his glorious kingdom. Those who should be faithful to their Christian profession

until that time would enter into the joy and rest of the Messianic reign ; and if the author may be supposed to have been in accord with Paul, this fortune would also be that of those who, not living until that time, should die " in Christ," for they would share in the resurrection with " spiritual bodies."

A gospel or good tidings has indeed been preached to us, says the writer, as well as to them ; but the word heard did not profit them because " not mixed with faith in them that heard it." This rendering of King James' version is preferable to that of the revised which reads *because they were not united by faith with them that heard* (iv. 2).¹

Belief is necessary to the profitable hearing of the word of truth, for we *enter into that rest* as believers, according to the Psalm previously quoted to show that unbelievers in former times were excluded from the promised land (iv. 3).

Although the works (iv. 3).—This is said in order to show that the " rest " was already long since prepared. The rest in question is simply analogous to that which in the Hebrew tradition of the creation, naïvely accepted by the writer, God was supposed to have enjoyed at the end of the work of making the heavens and the earth.

Yet *after so long a time* (iv. 7), God says, *To-day if ye will hear. In David*, that is, the person through whom, according to the writer's idea of the inspiration of the Scripture writers, God spoke in the Psalm (xcv.), which is not Davidic, although ascribed to David in the Septuagint, from which the quotation was made.

For if Joshua (iv. 8).—This is said in confirmation of verse 7 *He would not have spoken.* The subject here is God.

There remaineth therefore a sabbath-rest (iv. 9); not a literal rest on the sabbath, but the term is employed as a type of blessedness. *The people of God* are those who are believing and obedient. Apostates would have no part in

¹ This translation is based upon the reading, *συγκειρασμένων*.

the blessed Messianic kingdom which was conceived as about to come.

For he that is entered (iv. 10).—The analogy above referred to is here indicated, and labour is enjoined, *lest any man fall after the same example of unbelief.*

For the word of God is living (iv. 12).—This “word” doubtless includes the entire message of God to man delivered both in the Old Testament and in the teaching of Jesus. No New Testament as an authoritative book containing “the word of God” was of course known to the writer. The epithet “living” means having in itself vital power and hence “active.” The two terms relate, according to the connection, to the retributive power of God exercised upon those who are unbelieving and disobedient. This idea is forcibly presented in the words, *sharper than any two-edged sword*, which divides those things that we think of as indivisible—the “soul,” the vital principle, and the “spirit” the immaterial, rational principle. Philo speaks in a similar manner of the Logos as the one who divides all things, the atoms even in the sensible sphere and in the supersensible the soul, speech, and perception. In the flaming sword (Gen. iii. 24) he finds a symbol of the Logos. The employment of this figure probably indicates the writer’s Alexandrian culture.¹

Quick to discern the thoughts (iv. 12).—This is probably intended to indicate God’s discernment of the moral quality of the intentions of men or His function as a judge.

In iv. 14-v. 10, the writer proceeds to establish the doctrine of the high-priesthood of Christ laid down in ii. 17 and iii. 1, to which “therefore” looks back.

A great high-priest (iv. 14).—So Philo characterises the Logos.² *Through the heavens* relates to Christ’s exaltation

¹ The epithet *τοιμας* “sounds like an echo of Philo’s doctrine concerning the cutting or dividing function of the Logos.”—Bruce, *Ep. to Heb.*, p. 167.

² *ὁ μέγας ἀρχιερεύς.*

to the right hand of God already mentioned (i. 3), and is to be understood literally from the cosmological point of view of the writer to whom "the heavens," designated as a locality through which the glorified Jesus is supposed to have "passed" in order to reach the throne of God, are the celestial, upper regions. See "higher than the heavens" (vii. 26) and "far above all the heavens" (Eph. iv. 10). The greatness and exaltation of the New Testament high-priest are thus indicated (Bleek). This "great high-priest" is no other than *Jesus the Son of God*—an epithet whereby his dignity is distinctively marked. Since such an exalted high-priest is ours, reasons the writer, *let us hold fast our confession*, that is, the confession of the Christian faith in general, which is spoken of here and in iii. 1 as if in the writer's time (the post-apostolic age) it had crystallised into a formula. But the exalted rank of Christ is not the only reason why in the opinion of our author the Christians should hold fast their confession.

Another motive is added in the declaration that *we have not a high-priest that cannot be touched with a feeling of our infirmities* (iv. 15).—Jesus having been "made in all respects" as we are is a sympathetic high-priest, having carried into his exalted heavenly state a remembrance of his experiences in the flesh. He accordingly regards with tenderness and compassion the weaknesses and infirmities which afflict men in their sinful earthly estate, and is able to represent them sympathetically before God, the judge.

In all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin (iv. 15).—This positive assertion is set over against the negative of the preceding clause. We meet here the problem suggested by ii. 10—how the writer's conception of the preëxistent Christ as a divine being endowed with almighty power is reconcilable with that of him as subject to temptation like men and hence exposed to the possibility of sinning. Perhaps the problem did not present itself to him at all, and if

it did, we have no means of knowing how he would have solved it. Paul nowhere speaks of Jesus as tempted by sin, yet our author surpasses the apostle in his exaltation of Christ in his preëxistent state. The declaration that he was *without sin* reminds us of a similar idea of Philo's regarding the Logos. The Jewish doctrine of the Messiah also assumed that he would be sinless.

The throne of grace (iv. 16).—Because the merciful and compassionate high-priest now sits at the right hand of God, where according to vii. 25 he “makes intercession” for those who approach “through him,” the throne of God is characterised as the throne of grace. Since the high-priest has “passed through the heavens” after his work of “propitiation,” the old order of strict retribution is conceived as no longer prevailing, but as superseded by the dispensation of “grace.” This is the doctrine of Paul, with whom it originated, but it is not definitely expressed in the teaching of Jesus.

A further elaboration of the theme of the high-priesthood of Christ is now made by showing that he possesses certain qualities which belong to high-priests qualified to minister under the law (v. 1-10).

The argument with which this section opens is closely connected with the declaration in iv. 15. Every high-priest is appointed for the sake of men, in order that by offering gifts and sacrifices he may mediate between God and men.

The high-priest must be one who *can bear gently with the ignorant and erring for that he himself also is compassed with infirmity* (v. 2).—The high-priest might offer atonement for sins committed through ignorance.¹ The word rendered *bear gently* means to observe a due moderation in sympathy. *Infirmity* must be understood in a moral sense, and of course does not imply the sinlessness of the subject. The author has, however, forestalled the pressing of this analogy too far

¹ Num. xv. 22-31.

by the preceding declaration that Jesus was "without sin." It must be conceded that his argument here is somewhat unskilful. It appears to support the absolute humanity of Jesus, though this is manifestly not his purpose.

No man taketh the honour to himself (v. 4).—Thus the comparison between Jesus and the Jewish high-priest is carried further, and related to the call to the office. Just as Aaron was *called of God*, so also was Christ, who *did not glorify himself*, but was glorified by God who appointed him, and who not only signified the high honour which He conferred upon him by calling him His Son, but also designated him as a *high-priest forever after the order of Melchizedek* (v. 6).

In Ps. cx. 4 these words are represented by the psalmist as addressed to a Hebrew king. They no more refer to Christ than any of the other passages interpreted by the writer as having such a reference (i. 5-13, ii. 6-8). The argument is that since Christ was not descended from Aaron, all of whose descendants were regarded as "called" in him, it might be maintained that he had assumed the rank of high-priest, to which he was not entitled. In that case he could not make a true atonement. But he was called or appointed to be a high-priest by the same authority by which he was assigned to his unique position of eminence as the Son of God, that is, by a divine authority. It is uncertain whether rank or succession is intended by *order of Melchizedek*.

Who [Christ] in the days of his flesh (v. 7).—The reference is to the agony of Jesus, and the writer had in mind perhaps the struggle in Gethsemane, with the account of which in the synoptic Gospels he may have been acquainted.

Him that was able to save him from death, and having been heard for his godly fear (v. 7).—The interpretation of this passage depends upon the sense in which the word rendered "godly fear" (εὐλάβεια) is understood. If it is taken as "reverence toward God" ("godly fear") the rendering of the revised version is correct, and the passage means that

Jesus was heard, when he prayed for deliverance from death, on account of this pious disposition. Those who understand the word in question to mean "fear" (of death), read the passage to mean "heard and delivered from this fear," and refer this deliverance to the angel who comforted Jesus, according to Luke xxii. 43, or, taking fear to stand for its object, death, to his resurrection. The word rendered "for" (*ἀπό*) in the revised version may mean "on account of" or "from." Against the latter interpretation it is urged that the writer must have meant that Jesus was delivered from that from which he prayed to be delivered, which was death, and not the fear of death. From this point of view he is regarded as having been "heard" in accordance with his prayer, which expressed submission to the divine will. This idea is somewhat far-fetched, and one cannot be certain that it was in the mind of the writer. The passage is undoubtedly obscure, and the best interpreters are divided as to its meaning.

Though he was a Son, learned obedience by what he suffered (v. 8).—The problem previously mentioned here recurs for the third time: How could he who preëxisted as the Son, a divine being, *learn obedience* for the first time in his earthly life? The explanation that he had before his passion the *disposition* of obedience which required, in order to prove its existence, to be confirmed by the act, is futile, for it is gratuitous to affirm that he did not actually obey until this great crisis. The author certainly implies his belief in the subordination of the Son in his preëxistent state to the Father, when he speaks of him as an "apostle" or one sent on a mission and as being for a time "made lower than the angels." The acceptance of these lowly fortunes implies obedience prior to his earthly sufferings.

And having been made perfect he became (v. 9).—The idea is that Jesus was not fitted to be the Saviour of men until he had the experience of suffering in his earthly estate. But

after having been "compassed with infirmity" (v. 2), and been "in all points tempted like as we are" (iv. 15), he was qualified to appear in heaven as a merciful and compassionate high-priest.—*Unto all them that obey*, that is all without regard to nationality, Jews and gentiles alike.

The section v. 11–vi. 20 proceeds, after a digression on the inability of the readers to understand the "things hard of interpretation" which the writer has to say, with an exhortation to "press on to perfection," with a warning against apostasy on account of the impossibility of renewal to repentance, and with a reminder of the promise made to Abraham.

Of whom we have many things to say (v. 11).—The reference is not to Melchizedek, but to Christ who, as "a high-priest after the order of Melchizedek," is the chief topic of the Epistle. The writer anticipates difficulty in making himself intelligible to his readers, because they have *become dull of hearing*, that is, in contrast with a previous condition of greater spiritual susceptibility to such doctrinal discussions and expositions.

For whom by reason of the time (v. 12).—The readers had been so long a time Christians that the writer thinks they ought to be qualified to become teachers of Christianity. This is a local colour which shows that the Epistle was not general, but was addressed to persons with whose circumstances the writer was acquainted. These words do not support a very early date for the Epistle. The readers had been instructed by hearers of Christ (ii. 3), some of their leaders or rulers had died (xiii. 3), and indifference and a tendency to apostasy had crept in among them. They must have belonged to the second or third generation of Christians.

The rudiments of the first principles of the oracles of God (v. 12), the most elementary principles of the revelation of God through Christ. The term "oracles of God" sometimes refers in early Christian writers to the Old Testament,¹ and

¹ Acts vii. 38; Rom. iii. 2.

again to utterances of Christian teachers.¹ The context clearly determines the meaning here.

And are become such as have need of milk (v. 12), that is, elementary instruction in Christianity, in which the writer evidently did not regard his doctrine of Christ as "a high-priest after the order of Melchizedek" as belonging.

Without experience (v. 13).—Since righteousness denotes the essential contents of Christianity, *inexperienced in the word of righteousness* means undeveloped and crude as Christians.

Have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil (v. 14).—The senses as physical organs of perception cannot, of course, be meant. A better rendering were "faculties of judgment."²

Wherefore let us cease to speak of the first principles of Christ (vi. 1).—*Wherefore* refers to the preceding, and the connection is: since you are yet babes in Christian doctrine, and the condition of perfection still lies before you. The translation, "let us cease to speak," rests upon the judgment that the writer meant to say: "Let me cease to talk of the first principles," etc. But the connection acquires the interpretation: "Do you, therefore, leave the first principles of Christ, and press on to perfection," the author including himself with his readers and saying, "let us press on." The old version is here preferable to the revised. The contrast is between the condition of babes occupied with the first principles of Christian instruction and that of "full-grown"

¹ 1 Pet. iv. 11.

² αἰσθητήρια, a word not elsewhere used in the New Testament. It occurs in the Septuagint, Jer. iv. 19, τὰ αἰσθητήρια τῆς ψυχῆς μου. Galen is quoted as saying that he who has his αἰσθητήριον well exercised may be the best judge or interpreter, ἀριστος—γνώμων. The reference of the word to the inner sense, the power of apprehending spiritual things, may be regarded as well supported. Verses 12-14 show a dependence on 1 Cor. iii. 1-3. See Jülicher, *Einleit.*, 1901, p. 122.

or "perfect" men, and "perfection" refers to a condition to be attained by the readers, and not to a teaching to be presented by the writer. Since they are exhorted to leave the first principles of Christianity and press to higher themes of doctrine, the writer enjoins upon them not to *lay anew the foundations of repentance from dead works and of faith toward God*.¹ He does not counsel them to reject these elements, but urges them to pass beyond them. Repentance from dead, that is, unfruitful, sinful works and faith in God as the one whose will and love are revealed through Christ were among the elementary doctrines of Christianity. It is not probable that the author had in mind "the works of the law," with reference to which repentance would be inappropriate.

Of the teaching of baptisms, etc. (vi. 2).—"Baptisms" (plural), with reference probably to the Christian rite in comparison with the various washings practised among the ceremonies of other religions (ix. 10). The *laying on of hands* was, however, a specifically Christian ceremony, and was performed in connection with baptism.² In the early Church baptism was connected with repentance and faith, and the latter with the resurrection of the dead.³ The resurrection of the dead and eternal judgment were doctrines both of Judaism and primitive Christianity. They were believed to be events of the Messianic reign which in the latter system was conceived as about to begin at the second coming of Christ.

For, as touching those who were once enlightened (vi. 4).—

¹ In placing "faith toward God" (πίστις ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν) among the rudiments which are to be left behind, the writer appears to have no such conception of faith as a condition of righteousness as obtains in the theology of Paul, where it is set over against "works": τῷ δὲ μὴ ἐργαζομένῳ, πιστεύοντι δὲ λογίζεται πίστις αὐτοῦ εἰς δικαιοσύνην (Rom. iv. 5). He rather regards it as simple confidence in God's promises.

² Acts viii. 16, 17, xix. 5, 6.

³ Acts ii. 38, xvii. 31, xxiv. 14, 15, xxvi. 8.

For relates to the exhortation in verse 3, "this let us do" (which is the meaning instead of "this we will do," according to a well-supported reading of the Greek text). The urgent appeal to the readers that they should advance toward higher attainments in the Christian life is now strengthened by a warning of the danger of apostasy. *Enlightened* are those who have received the truth of the gospel of Jesus.¹ *And tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost.* The Holy Ghost was regarded as a gift in the primitive Church,² and the two expressions perhaps have essentially the same meaning. The early Christians attributed their religious experiences to a "heavenly" and supernatural source.

Tasted the good word of God (vi. 5), the gospel, as that spoken by God (i. 2). The repetition of "tasted" is awkward. *And the powers of the age to come*, the Messianic age to be introduced by the expected second coming of Christ (ii. 5). The *powers* of that age are conceived to be the wonderful operations of the Holy Spirit, which had already begun, and been "tasted" in the then present age.

It is impossible to renew them again unto repentance (vi. 6).—*Impossible* (ἀδύνατον) is here used in the absolute sense, and it is unwarrantable to soften it into "extremely difficult" or any analogous expression.

In the manner in which the writer of the Epistle here speaks of a sin for which repentance is impossible and in the terms employed he stands alone among the New Testament writers. The sin in question is not the so-called blasphemy against the Holy Ghost,³ which consisted in charging Jesus with having an unclean spirit. If it was a sin against Jesus, as that called "unto death" in 1 John v. 16 is according to the connection, it might be forgiven (and in forgiveness repentance is, of course, implied),⁴ as he himself declares. But the sin is simply and only that of falling away or apostasy from the con-

¹ 2 Cor. iv. 4, 6; 1 Pet. ii. 9.

² Acts xi. 17.

³ Matt. xii. 31; Mark iii. 29.

⁴ Matt. xii. 32.

fession of Christ after having enjoyed the blessings and privileges of a Christian experience. According to the illustration which follows (*vv.* 7-9), it is unfruitfulness, the bearing of "thorns and thistles" where "herbs meet for them for whose sake it [the land] is also tilled" might be expected. The harsh judgment of the author is not supported by the cases of Peter and Judas,¹ by any known psychological law, or by any facts of human experience. On the other hand it would appear according to the doctrine of the author himself that Christ, as the great high-priest who on the cross prayed for the forgiveness of his enemies, would take a more hopeful and sympathetic view of the case of those who crucify him "afresh" in that they "fall away." Paul appears never to have despaired of the ultimate salvation of believers. Even the spirit of the incestuous man was to be "saved in the day of the Lord," although he was delivered over to Satan.²

For God is not unrighteous to forget (vi. 10).—The writer hopes "better things" of his readers than the desperate fortunes depicted in verse 6, and represents their preservation from it as due to God's remembrance of their former charities, as if a hopeless apostasy were not dependent upon their own volition and action, but upon the disposition of God toward them on account of their treatment of the "saints." It is not clear whether he means that God would shield them from apostasy, or, in case they should apostatise, would not treat them as apostates. In either case the doctrine appears to be that former good works may in some way save men from falling into a condition from which it is "impossible to renew them to repentance," and that they are not left to themselves to induce by "an irreversible natural law" a "permanent fixedness of character." The idea that their hope lies in antecedent "works" accords with the teaching of Jesus rather than with Paul's doctrine of "justification by faith."

For when God made promise to Abraham (vi. 13).—For connects the following with the last clause of verse 12, and

¹ Matt. xxvi. 75, xxvii. 3.

² 1 Cor. v. 5.

the teaching is that perseverance in faith and patience secures the enjoyment of the "promises" of God. The illustration is drawn from the story of Abraham.¹

Swear by Himself *interposed with an oath* (vi. 13 and 17).—The naïve Jewish and primitive-Christian conception of God is here expressed, according to which He is represented as acting after the manner of men even to the taking of an oath for solemn confirmation. Philo also remarks on the circumstance that God swore "not by another, but by Himself who is the best of all." In the Old Testament God is sometimes represented as swearing in anger.²

That by two immutable things (vi. 18), that is, the promise, or perhaps its supposed fulfilment in the gospel, and the oath. The words, *that* *we may have a strong encouragement*, etc., imply, according to the writer's method of interpreting the Old Testament wherever possible with reference to the Christian economy, that he regarded the promise to Abraham as made in view of the believers of primitive-Christian times. It is ungrammatical to interpret, "so that we have," etc. Interpretations similar to that in verse 18 abound in the writers of the early Church. The Old Testament was their only written authority, and they allegorised it (made it say something else than it really said) whenever it suited their purpose to do so.³

As an anchor (vi. 19), a means of safety in the storm and stress of earthly trial.

Both sure and steadfast and entering into that which is within the veil (vi. 19).—It is unnecessary to supply "a hope" here, as is done in the revised version. The figure of the anchor is carried out to the end of the clause. *The veil* refers to the curtain hung in the tabernacle before the holy of holies, and entering within the veil is a figure for extending into heaven, *whither as a forerunner Jesus entered*

¹ Gen. xxii. 16-19.

² Num. xxxii. 10; Deut. i. 34.

³ 1 Cor. ix. 9, 10.

for us (vi. 20), according to iv 14 (see ix. 12, 24). The writer now returns to the theme mentioned in v. 10.

The author now goes to work in earnest to develop and establish his theme of the high-priesthood of Christ after the order of Melchizedek (vii. 1-28). In proceeding to show first what it means to be such a high-priest, he devotes a little space to a consideration of the man Melchizedek (vv. 1-10).

*King of Salem, priest of God Most High (vii. 1).*¹—The author follows the story in Genesis of the meeting of Abraham and Melchizedek, in which the latter is designated as a “priest of the Most High God.” The author of this portion of Genesis doubtless adopted the tradition that Jerusalem, near which Salem probably was,² if it was not a name for Jerusalem itself,³ was always the seat of the worship of the Hebrew supreme God, *El*. Accordingly, in saying that Melchizedek was a priest of the Most High God, he had in mind the national divinity, Yahweh.

King of righteousness *King of peace (vii. 2),* that is, by interpretation of the Hebrew names, “Melchizedek” and “Salem.”⁴ It is noteworthy that Philo had previously given a similar interpretation. The appropriateness of the ideas of “righteousness” and “peace” to Jesus may have influenced the writer’s conception of a parallel between him and Melchizedek. The fancy of the allegoriser was quick to seize upon such verbal analogies.

Without father. without mother (vii. 3).—Since no mention of Melchizedek’s parents is made in Genesis, the writer arbitrarily concludes according to the allegorising of Philo, “from the silence of the Scriptures,” that he had none! This idea accords with his purpose, which is to show that Melchizedek, a “type” of Christ, was superior to the levitical priests, who did not enjoy the distinction of having come

¹ See Gen. xiv. 18-20.

² John iii. 23.

³ See Ps. lxxvi. 2.

⁴ Josephus, *Jewish Wars*, vi. 10.

into the world without fathers and mothers. Probably he did not intend to press his interpretation by types so far as to draw the inference that Jesus, in his earthly existence at least, was without parents, for in verse 14 he says that "it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah."

*Having neither beginning of days nor end of life (vii. 3).—*This is an inference from the fact that in Genesis there is no mention of the beginning or end of Melchizedek.

*But made like unto the Son of God (vii. 3).—*According to the writer's method of interpretation Melchizedek was a "type" of Christ. The resemblances which his fancy seizes upon are found in the name and residence—"righteousness" and "peace"—and in the absence of "genealogy," allegorically read into the Old Testament account, and doubtless applied to the preëxistent being of Christ, despite the fact that he calls him the Son of God.

*Abideth a priest continually (vii. 3).—*The subject is Melchizedek (*v. 1*). *Continually* here means "forever," as in *x. 12, 14*. The perpetuity of Melchizedek's priesthood is inferred from the fact that no end of it is mentioned in Genesis, because it suited the author's fancy that he was a type of Christ. He now proceeds to argue (*vv. 4-10*) the superiority of Melchizedek to the levitical priests from the fact that to "this great man" Abraham gave tithes. Now the sons of Levi receive tithes, though they are descendants of Abraham. But Melchizedek, who was not one of the offspring of Levi, received tithes of Abraham. Therefore Levi, who was yet unborn when these tithes were paid, in fact, paid tithes to Melchizedek! The conclusion is obvious that, according to this method of reasoning, Melchizedek as a priest outranks the levitical priesthood, so that Christ, of whom "this great man" was a type, is a high-priest superior to the priests under the law. Melchizedek was greater than Abraham, for it is the greater who gives the blessing. Besides, Melchizedek was not mortal like the levitical priests

who take tithes, because *it is witnessed that he liveth* (v. 8), that is, by "the silence of the Scriptures" about his death.

The argument now proceeds to show that the levitical priesthood, having together with the Mosaic law become invalid, has been superseded by a better (vv. 11-17).

If there was perfection by the levitical priesthood (vii. 11).—A conditional clause implying a negative. Since the levitical priesthood was imperfect, that is, incapable of making a perfect atonement, there was *need that another priest should arise after the order of Melchizedek*. Since, then, under the levitical priesthood the people received the law, a change of the former rendered necessary a change of the latter (v. 12). The expression is mild and cautious, but more than a "change" is evidently meant, as is apparent from verse 18, in which the author, grown bolder, employs a term which expresses nothing short of the abrogation of the law. This Pauline idea is not, however, expressed in Pauline terms.

For he of whom those things are said (vii. 13).—The levitical priesthood and the law of Moses here become invalid, because the new high-priest, Christ, sprang from another tribe than that of Levi, from a tribe which had furnished no priest.

For it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah (vii. 14).—The writer speaks of this physical descent of Jesus as a well known and undisputed fact. He appears, like Paul and the other authors of the canonical Epistles, to have known nothing of the story of the miraculous conception of the mother of Jesus, or at least not to have accepted it. Descent from Judah thus unqualifiedly expressed can mean nothing else than paternity through that line.

And what we say is yet more abundantly evident (vii. 15-17).—Another proof is presented of the disuse of the old priesthood and the Mosaic law in the contention that the new high-priest "after the order of Melchizedek" was not made according to the external and perishable law regarding the

levitical priesthood, but *after the power of an endless life*, that is, he is not a mortal high-priest, but one who "abideth forever" (v. 24), as is "witnessed" by the passage from the Psalm before quoted.

The significance of the establishment of this new high-priesthood is now declared to be nothing short of the *disannulling of a foregoing commandment* (vii. 18, 19), because it was inadequate as a means of atonement. The *commandment*, the entire levitical legislation, was weak and unprofitable, and a *better hope* is furnished in this new high-priesthood, a hope *through which we draw nigh unto God*.¹ The ample atonement of the great high-priest and his heavenly office as intercessor are the foundation of a hope which brings men into closer relations with God. The author here expresses a practical vital principle of Christianity as he understood it.

Never tiring of quoting from the Old Testament, the writer now strengthens his argument, as he supposes, by recurring to the "oath" of God respecting the perpetuity of the priesthood in question (vii. 21). See note on v. 6 and vi. 13-20. Since the old priesthood was instituted without an oath of God, His oath in this case makes Christ *the surety of a better covenant* (vii. 22).

Another reason for the superiority of the high-priest Christ over the levitical priesthood is found in the fact that the latter was composed of mortal beings who were hindered by death from continuing perpetually in office (vii. 23), while the former *abideth forever*, and has an *unchangeable priesthood* (vii. 24).

¹ The writer's depreciation of the law is quite unqualified. He does not even accord to the Mosaic economy an historical place and worth in the education of mankind. Paul, while arraigning it on other grounds than our author's, could still recognise it as given "unto life," as "holy, just, and good" (Rom. vii. 10, 12), and as a "school-master unto Christ" (Gal. iii. 24); but here there are no such epithets to soften the harshness of the judgment upon the old dispensation. It is bluntly declared to be *ἀσθενὲς καὶ ἀνωφελές*, weak and unprofitable—a law of a carnal commandment, *ἐν τοῦ ἁμαρτανίου*. According to Paul, it is the *flesh* that is weak (*ἀσθενής*.)

Wherefore he is able to save to the uttermost, etc. (vii. 25), that is, to save most completely, perfectly to deliver from sin and its consequences and also without doubt to give a place in his kingdom about to come upon the earth.

Them that draw near to God through him he can save, since he is the mediator between God and men who, having "passed through the heavens" and been "seated on the right of God," *ever liveth to make intercession for them*. The idea that Christ in his exalted state makes "intercession" for men is expressed by Paul,¹ and the writer of 1 John (ii. 1) speaks of an "Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." But neither of those writers enters upon the question how it is conceivable that God as "the Father" should need or could tolerate in His presence an advocate or intercessor in behalf of His own children. The doctrine can logically carry only the implication of a deficiency in His wisdom or His love. Philo ascribes this function to the Logos.

Finally, Christ is shown to be a more excellent high-priest than those of the levitical order, because the latter were sinful men who must daily offer *sacrifices for their own sins and then for the sins of the people*, while he was holy, guileless, undefiled (vii. 26, 27). Besides, having been *made higher than the heavens*,² he is forever before God in behalf of men (see verse 25) and is *separated from sinners*.

Who needeth not daily (vii. 27).—This is not strictly accurate. The Jewish high-priest did not officiate "daily." The writer has probably confused the office of this functionary with the usual daily sacrifices offered by the priests.

Once for all, when he offered himself (vii. 27), that is, one time for all times. The one sacrifice of Christ sufficed for a full atonement or satisfaction for the sins of men. Accordingly, he is not alone the high-priest of the new covenant, who is superior to the levitical priests in that he needed only

¹ Rom. viii. 34.

² See iv. 14 and Eph. iv. 10.

once to make an offering, but he is also in his own person the offering itself which, by so much as he is great, is better than all the sacrifices presented by the old priesthood (viii. 3, ix. 12, 14, 25, x. 10, 12, 14).

The doctrine of the high-priesthood of Christ, the credit for the first elaborate presentation of which belongs to the author of Hebrews, is an inheritance of Christianity from Judaism, or, more strictly speaking, it is a product of Hellenistic Christianity, or the Christianity of a Judaism affected by Greek culture and ideas. It may be traced to the high-priesthood of the Logos in Philo of Alexandria, by whose writings the author of the Epistle was doubtless considerably influenced. Philo applied the title "high-priest" to the Logos, conceived by him as a supersensible entity without participation in human earthly fortunes. Our author does not, like the writer of the fourth Gospel, specifically apply the term "Logos" to Christ, but he represents a type of theology which was well advanced toward this Johannine idea. It is not entirely clear whether or no he regarded Christ in his preëxistent state as the high-priest of the new covenant. The words in vii. 3 seem to favour this hypothesis, where he says that Melchizedek who was "without genealogy" was "made like unto the Son of God" and "abideth a priest continually."

But the idea of a high-priesthood is not here necessarily connected with the Son of God, who is evidently referred to as in i. 2, 3, with reference to conditions antedating his appearance in the flesh, in which he is not conceived as "without genealogy" (vii. 14). On the other hand, the writer appears to regard Jesus' earthly life as a preparation for the high-priesthood. He conceives the true and fitting high-priest for men to be one who can be "touched with the feeling of our infirmities," and who has been "tempted in all points as we are" (iv. 14, 15), and does not regard Jesus in his capacity of high-priest as "the author of eternal salvation," until he had in his human life "learned obedience" through suffering and been "made perfect," that is, perfectly fitted for his work as Saviour (ii. 17). The real, perfect high-priest, however, is not recognised by the author in the Jesus of earthly experience, the suffering and tempted one, but only in the exalted Son of God who had "passed through the heavens" (iv. 14, v. 9), where he "abideth forever" in an "unchangeable priesthood" (vii. 24). "If he were on earth, he would not be a priest at all" (viii. 4), but as the true high-priest he did not enter into a holy place

made with hands, but into heaven itself (ix. 24). His sacrifice on the cross provided the means of atonement by virtue of which he appears as the heavenly high-priest "before the face of God for us." "The things in the heavens" must be "cleansed with better sacrifices" than their "copies" on the earth (ix. 23), and it is as an intercessor for men "before the face of God," where he is entitled to stand by reason of his suffering, that he is conceived to be the real high-priest of the new and better covenant.

This idea of the earthly life of Jesus as a preparation for the heavenly high-priesthood denotes a departure from Philo possible only to a christianised Alexandrian, to whom the person Jesus and not the superseisable Logos was the central figure. Philo's high-priest after the order of Melchizedek "no longer hovers forever in remote heights, but he has assumed flesh and blood, is tempted, and has suffered like men (ii. 14, 18, iv. 15, v. 7), and his earthly suffering has first made him capable of serving men as a high-priest. Thereby is the chasm, which yawned with Philo between the world above and the earth, bridged over. Life has come into the unchangeable inflexibility of that world of ideas. Theosophy is changed into religion." But this divine, preëxistent Son of God, apparently next to Deity Himself the most exalted being in the universe, is supposed to have needed this school of human life in order to "learn" that which should qualify him for his office. If the author conceived him to have "emptied himself" of his divinity,¹ the problem still remains how he could have thought him to be the same being as before.

Our interest in this subject, the high-priesthood of Christ, is chiefly historical. It is an idea conceived by the author of the Epistle, is without foundation in the teaching of Jesus, and is based upon an erroneous interpretation of passages from the Old Testament. The fact that it appears in a writing which has been received into the New Testament canon does not give it the importance of a doctrine of Christianity.

The next step in the argument of the Epistle is to show that the sanctuary in which Christ as high-priest officiates is superior to the levitical, for it is heavenly and not made with hands. The service which he performs is as much above the old priestly function as the covenant under which he ministers is better than the former (viii. 1-13).

Sat down on the right hand (viii. 1).—See i. 3, ii. 9, iv. 14,

¹ Phil. ii. 7.

vii. 26. Having been thus exalted, the ministry of this great high-priest is that *of the sanctuary and of the true tabernacle which God pitched, not man* (viii. 2). It is not a ministry of the earthly tabernacle, but is in heaven "before the face of God." *There exists the true tabernacle*, the original type, of which the tabernacle of the levitical priesthood is only a "copy" or a "shadow." In expressing this idea the author shows his dependence upon the Alexandrian thought. The Alexandrian Book of Wisdom contains a similar conception respecting the altar as an imitation of that prepared by God from the beginning. *Which the Lord pitched*, that is God. "Lord" is elsewhere used of God in the Epistle only in citations from the Old Testament.

Have somewhat to offer (viii. 3).—This does not mean that in his function in the heavenly tabernacle, Christ actually "offers" his body as a sacrifice, but that he appears there for atonement, by reason of having offered it in his earthly passion.

Now if he were on the earth he would not be a priest at all (viii. 4).—On the earth he would have no priestly function. Only two kinds of priests are known to the author—those on the earth, the levitical priests, and the one high-priest in heaven, who does not *offer gifts according to the law*, but under the new covenant ministers in "the true tabernacle."

The former *serve that which is a copy and shadow of the heavenly things* (viii. 5)—an indication of the inferiority and imperfection of the earthly sanctuary as contrasted with the heavenly. The Platonic doctrine of Ideas appears here by way of the Alexandrian school in a Christian writer of the first century.

According to the pattern shown to thee in the mount (viii. 5).¹—The writer supposes Moses to have seen by way of divine revelation the original type or pattern of the Jewish

¹ See Ex. xxv. 40.

tabernacle (or as Plato would say the Idea of it), when he was on Sinai.

The mediator of a better covenant (viii. 6).¹—Christ is conceived as intervening between God and men in order to turn aside by his atonement the consequences of sin. Paul does not call Jesus a “mediator,” but following Philo he applies the term to Moses.²

The writer now declares again the imperfection of the old covenant, and proceeds to give proof from Scripture of the establishment of a new and better one (vv. 7-12). The “new covenant,” however, of which mention is made in the quotation from Jeremiah xxxi. 31-34, relates historically to the restoration of the Jews, and is a covenant promised with the people of the northern and southern kingdoms or Israel and Judah (v. 9). The writer of the Epistle, in accordance with his allegorical method of interpretation, understands it to mean the new covenant of the Christian dispensation. This appears from verse 13, in which he speaks of the old covenant, or the Old Testament economy, as *aged and nigh unto vanishing away*.

The author now proceeds (ix. 1-x. 18) to an exposition of the work of the great high-priest, Christ, and introduces the subject with an account of the arrangements of the old sanctuary, which he regards as showing in their character its temporary and perishable nature.

A worldly sanctuary (ix. 1).—This is accusative coordinate with “ordinances of divine service.” The adjective κοσμικόν, from κόσμος, can have no other meaning than worldly or pertaining to the world, *mundanus*. A contrast is thus indicated between the sanctuary of the Old Covenant and that of the New, the worldly in opposition to the heavenly (ἐπουράνιον).³

¹ See ix. 15, xii. 24; 1 Tim. ii. 5.

² Gal. iii. 19, 20.

³ Cf. κατὰ τὴν κοσμικὴν διάταξιν, Plutarch, *De Consolat.*

Having a *golden censer*, etc. (ix. 4).—The proper rendering of the word is “altar of incense,” and the writer has committed an “archæological error” in saying that it was in the most holy place. The statement of the contents of the ark of the covenant is not according to 1 Kings viii. 9.—*Once in the year* (ix. 7) is not strictly accurate. “One day in the year” would have been correct, for the high-priest entered more than once in the performance of his functions.

In all the arrangements and regulations described in the foregoing (ix. 1-7) the author regards the Holy Ghost, that is, the Spirit of God, who from his point of view established the levitical institution, as signifying this which follows: *that the way into the holy place hath not yet been made manifest, while as* [during the time that] *the first tabernacle is yet standing* (ix. 8), that is, the entrance of the high-priest once a year into the holy of holies (for which the “holy place” here stands) does not manifest the true way into it, or the way adequate to the needs of men, which is shown only by the perpetual appearance of Christ, the great high-priest, on their behalf “before the face of God.”

Which is a parable for the time now present (ix. 9).—Which refers to “the first tabernacle” that is regarded as a symbol with reference to the present time, in other words, is a type of the new dispensation and the greater high-priesthood. *According to which* [the first tabernacle] *are offered*, that is, in accordance with the law governing the first tabernacle certain gifts and sacrifices are offered.

That cannot as touching the conscience make the worshipper perfect (ix. 9), that is, cannot enable him to attain a state of perfection satisfactory to his conscience.

Until a time of reformation (ix. 10), the time of the coming of Christ, the true high-priest, who will fulfil his function perfectly, and become the “author of everlasting salvation.”

A high-priest of the good things to come (ix. 11), the good things of the “everlasting salvation” of which Christ was

the "author." These are called future because conceived as to be realised in the Messianic age, which the second coming of Christ was expected to introduce (ii. 5, vi. 5).

The connection in **vv. 11** and **12** is: *Christ having come entered in once for all into the holy place through the greater and more perfect tabernacle through his own blood, having obtained eternal redemption.* His entrance into the holy place, that is, the heavenly sanctuary or holy of holies, is conceived as being *through* the heavenly tabernacle. The matter is a little confused, since the writer appears to distinguish between the *tabernacle* (v. 11) and the *holy place* (v. 12), while in viii. 2 he seems to make them identical. If they are interpreted as separate, the *greater and more perfect*, that is, the heavenly, *tabernacle* is probably conceived as "the lower parts of the heavens" contrasted with the highest heavens where the throne of God was supposed to be. See "passed through the heavens" (iv. 14).

Through his own blood (**ix. 12**), by means of his own blood, or because of his sacrifice on the cross. *Having obtained eternal redemption.* *Eternal* corresponds to *once for all*, that is, all time. The *redemption* is regarded as permanently effective and needing no renewal, and means ransom, deliverance from the guilt and penalty of sin. It is here conceived as effected through the atoning death of Christ according to verse 22, "apart from the shedding of blood there is no remission."

The word here rendered redemption (*λύτρωσις*), together with the corresponding verb, is confined in the New Testament to Luke, Hebrews, 1 Peter, and the Epistle to Titus. It is not, accordingly, employed by Paul, although the idea is substantially his, and is expressed by a word which literally means "buy off."¹ In the Hebrew system certain sins might be atoned for, the penalty "bought off" or averted by the offering of sacrifices.² The New Testament writers who give

¹ ἐξαγοράζω, Gal. iii. 13, iv. 5. But see ἀπολυτρώσις, 1 Cor. i. 30.

² Levit. iv. v. vi.; Job i. 5. xlii. 8.

expression to the idea of ransom or redemption apply it to sin in general without discriminating between sins for which atonement could be made and others. The conception of redemption in the sense in which it is employed here came into apostolic Christianity from Judaism. It does not accord with the general teaching of Jesus respecting the relation of man to God.

The relation of the doctrine of Hebrews that Christ in his death offered a *sacrifice* for sin on behalf of men to the Pauline conception of his atonement has long been in dispute. Some expositors of Paul deny, and others affirm that he conceived of the death of Christ as a sacrifice. It must be conceded that some obscurity attaches to his teaching on this point. In Rom. iii. 25, 26 Paul declares that Christ was set forth as a propitiation to declare God's righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, which by reason of the divine "forbearance" had not been adequately punished. The idea is that in the representative death of Christ as the head of the race the proof was furnished that the penalty for sin which the divine righteousness requires was inflicted. The benefits of this substitution accrue to those who by faith avail themselves of it.¹ These, "justified by the blood" of Christ, are "saved from the wrath of God,"² that is, they will enter into the eternal life of the Messianic kingdom when Christ shall come again. Through the intervention of this great "race-man," the "man from heaven," through his having been "made sin for us who knew no sin,"³ free scope is conceived as given to the divine grace, and God no longer reckons their trespasses against⁴ men who accept the offered favour, since by the great "propitiation" His attitude toward them has been changed. It can hardly be denied that the idea of sacrifice is contained in this scheme. It was "in the blood" of Christ that the propitiation was made. He "redeemed" us, the believers, from the curse of the law, that is, by his sacrifice "bought us off" from it, having been himself "made a curse for us" in his death,⁵ for all men as sinners were "under the curse" through not having kept the law,⁶ and could be delivered only by this great offering. In treating Christ as a sinner God laid upon him the consequences of the sins of others, who through faith may "become the righteousness of God in him." Christ stands in the place of men over against the justice of God, and they receive the benefits of this substitution in that through faith his righteousness is "reckoned" to them. If, as is

¹ Rom. iii. 26.³ 2 Cor. v. 21.⁵ Gal. iii. 13.² *Ibid.*, v. 9.⁴ *Ibid.*, v. 19.⁶ *Ibid.*, iii. 10.

probable, the conception of sacrifice in later Judaism involved the idea that the blood of the victim was given for the life of the guilty person, this circumstance is favourable to the contention that the Pauline atonement should be construed as sacrificial. The question cannot, however, be regarded as closed.

How much more shall the blood of Christ who through the eternal Spirit offered himself unto God (ix. 14).—The expression *through the eternal Spirit* presents some difficulty, especially when the article is inserted as in the revised and King James' versions. The rendering of Noyes is better: "through *his* eternal spirit." But the original contains neither article nor pronoun, and "through eternal spirit" means through the spiritual power by means of which he did and does his work for men. The epithet *eternal* characterises the efficacy of his high-priesthood as perpetual in contrast with that of the levitical priests which was temporary and perishable.¹

Without blemish (ix. 14), that is, fulfilling the conditions of a perfect offering and hence acceptable (see iv. 15).

Cleanse your conscience from dead works, purify the inner man from sinful works and fit the soul for the service of the living God (ix. 14).

And for this cause he is the mediator of a new covenant (ix.

¹ The late Dr. Bruce, whose work on the Epistle comes to the author's hand as this book is going through the press, remarks on the word "eternal" (*αἰώνιον*): "The epithet 'eternal' suggests the thought: the act performed by Jesus in offering himself may, as an historical event, become old with the lapse of ages; but the spirit in which the act was done can never become a thing of the past. The blood shed was corruptible; but the spirit which found expression in Christ's self-sacrifice is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever, and in its eternal self-identity lends to the priestly deed imperishable merit and significance."—*The Epistle to the Hebrews: the first Apology for Christianity*, 1899, p. 339. So Holtzmann: "Blood and flesh are thought of as only transient bases of the eternal spirit."—*Neutest. Theol.* ii. p. 289.

15).—*This cause* relates to the thought expressed in vv. 11–14. The central idea of the new covenant in contrast with the old is, according to this author, the atoning sacrifice of Christ, who offered himself, and became an everlasting high-priest, over against the inferior offerings and the temporary priesthood of the levitical institution.

That a death having taken place (ix. 15).—The occurrence of a [sacrificial] death is regarded as a condition of the establishment of a covenant. The death here referred to is that of Christ (see vv. 16, 17).

For the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant (ix. 15).—The idea is that notwithstanding the offerings made under the old covenant, the transgressions which were committed during its existence were not adequately atoned for.

They that have been called may receive the promise of the eternal inheritance (ix. 15).—The “called” are in the Pauline usages those who are foreordained to accept the invitation extended to them in the gospel. But the connection here forbids the exclusive application of the word to those living under the Christian dispensation. Besides, the use of the perfect participle appears to indicate a reference to those called in a former time and to those still called in the present. How he conceived the invitation of the gospel to have been extended to the Jews who lived prior to the time of Christ is not clear. Perhaps he thought of the gospel as retroactive through the Old Testament which he regarded as filled with allusions and prophecies respecting it. But Christianity would thus hardly be placed before men in such a manner that some could be said to accept and others to reject it, so that the former might be designated as “the called.” Perhaps again he thought “the called” to be the pious Israelites, and he might have extended the designation to those among all nations who had dutifully lived according to such light as they had. In any case it is evident that he

regarded the effectiveness of the gospel as retroactive (see verse 26 and xi. 39, 40). He does not appear to have been concerned about the fate of those persons not included among "the called."

Eternal inheritance (ix. 15).—The "inheritance" (κληρονομία) denotes the participation in the Messianic kingdom to be ushered in by Jesus at his second coming. It originally meant the possession of the promised land (κληρονομία τῆς γῆς) by the seed of Abraham. Just as the Messianic kingdom conferred upon its heirs "eternal life" and "eternal salvation" (v. 9), so it is here called an "eternal (αἰωνίου) inheritance."

For where a testament is there must of necessity be the death of him that made it (ix. 16).—The word translated "testament" in verses 16 and 17 is the same one in the original that is rendered "covenant" in the foregoing. It is manifest that a "death" has nothing to do with the establishment of a covenant; but since the same word has both meanings, the writer was plainly led into a logical error in his zeal to find occasion for bringing the death of Christ into his argument. These two verses denote a departure from the course of thought of the Epistle, and the reader will do well to disregard them entirely. The conclusion drawn in verse 18 is of course pointless.

He took the blood of the calves and the goats with water and scarlet wool and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book itself and all the people (ix. 19).—The passage which lies at the basis of this account is found in Exodus xxiv. 3-8, but it contains no mention of the blood of calves and goats, of water and scarlet wool and hyssop and of the sprinkling of the book. The writer has evidently confused other ceremonial observances with the ratification of the covenant.

The blood of the testament (ix. 20).—See x. 29, xiii. 20. The employment of this expression with reference to the shedding of the blood of Jesus perhaps indicates the influence

on the writer of the words of the Master recorded in Matt. xxvi. 28; Mark xiv. 24; Luke xxii. 20. This cannot, however, be positively affirmed, since the words occur in the Septuagint version of Ex. xxiv. 8, and may have been current in the religious speech and ritual of the time of the writer. In like manner, the "redemption" in verse 12 is an Old Testament idea, and need not be referred to Mark x. 45. "Shepherd of the sheep" (xiii. 20) is used only once in the Epistle, and occurs in the Septuagint version of Isa. lxiii. 10. The influence of Mark vi. 34, xiv. 27, and Matt. ii. 6 is not, however, necessarily excluded. Yet the reference of "heir of all things" (i. 2) to Mark xii. 7 by von Soden is forced.

Moreover the tabernacle (ix. 21).—Another error is committed in this statement, since the tabernacle was not yet constructed when the ceremony of confirming the covenant occurred to which the writer here refers. Moreover, when the tabernacle was consecrated it was not ordered that it be *sprinkled with blood*, but that it be anointed with oil.¹ *The vessels* are of course not mentioned in the account which the writer reproduces with amplifications, and where they are mentioned in Exodus they are said, like the tabernacle, to have been anointed with oil. In view of these considerations the qualifying expression, *I may almost say (ix. 22)* is very properly inserted.

Without the shedding of blood there is no remission (ix. 22).—This is said with reference to the so-called "Mosaic law." In the Hebrew sacrificial system certain sins might be atoned for by the offering of animal life. But the author wishes to have it understood that the "new covenant" is not different from the old so far as *the shedding of blood* is concerned. The superiority of the former lies in the rank and dignity of the propitiator, who makes atonement with "his own blood," and makes it once for all time.

¹ Ex. xl. 9.

It was necessary, therefore, that the copies of the things in the heavens should be cleansed with these (ix. 23).—The appointments of the levitical sacrificial rites, which are only *copies* of the true heavenly tabernacles, may be purified with such material things as were used for that purpose; but the *heavenly things*, the place not made with hands, into which Christ entered as the “high-priest forever after the order of Melchizedek,” must be cleansed *with better sacrifices than these*, that is, with the sacrifice of Christ himself who appears there as an intercessor to plead the offering which he made on the cross.

Now to appear before the face of God for us (ix. 24).—Christ, the great high-priest, might come into the very presence of God, on whom no man could look and live.¹ *For us*, that is, to “make intercession” (vii. 25).

Else must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world (ix. 26).—The writer proves his doctrine that Christ suffered once for all time by showing the contrary to be absurd. Since men have always sinned, it would be necessary, he reasons, if Christ did not suffer once for all time, that his sacrifice should have been made *often*.² He wisely refrains from venturing upon a determination of the period of time which he conceives a single sacrifice to cover.

But now at the end of the ages hath he been manifested to put away sin (ix. 26).—The time of the coming of Jesus in the flesh is designated as *the end of the ages*, that is, the end of the world-period sometimes called “the present age” in contradiction to “the age to come,” or the age of the second coming of Christ to establish the Messianic kingdom (see note on i. 1). *To put away sin by his sacrifice.* This is the proper rendering rather than “the sacrifice of himself.”

¹ Ex. xxxiii. 20; but see Ex. xxiv. 10, 11.

² The idea that Christ's death was “once for all” is Pauline: “In that he died, he died unto sin once” (Rom. vi. 10). See vii. 27, ix. 12, x. 12.

The suffering of Christ is regarded as effective for the destruction of sin in the sense that his blood may "cleanse the conscience from dead works" (verse 14). The words must also mean the "disannulling" (vii. 18, where the same Greek word is used) of sin in the sense of rendering its penal consequences void, according to the analogy of the Jewish sacrifices adopted by the author.

And inasmuch as it is appointed unto men once to die, and after this cometh judgment (ix. 27).—Here *once* is intended to carry out the idea in verse 26 that Christ was manifested "once." The *judgment* is regarded, in accordance with the prevailing primitive-Christian doctrine, as taking place after death. Probably the word rendered *appointed* in the first clause should be supplied in the second, so that the latter would read, "and after this is appointed judgment." The writer speaks vaguely of judgment, and it is uncertain whether he thought of it as taking place immediately after death or after the resurrection, which according to Paul was to occur at the second coming of Christ.¹ In 1 Cor. iv. 4, 5 Paul places the judgment at this time. See also 1 Thess. v. 3.

So Christ also shall appear a second time, apart from sin, to them that wait for him, unto salvation (ix. 28).—This is a distinct announcement of the belief of the apostolic and post-apostolic age in the second coming of Christ. *Apart from sin* is said with reference to the expression immediately preceding, "to bear the sins of many,"² and means that in

¹ 1 Thess. iv. 16.

² Here is indicated the tendency which early appeared in the Christian Church to dogmatise on the death of Jesus. A Messiah shamefully put to death was an intolerable conception. The death of Jesus must, accordingly, have had a profound significance. Isa. liii. readily lent itself to an interpretation in the interest of a substitutional atonement. See Matt. viii. 16, 17; 1 Pet. ii. 21 ff. The doctrine of the Jewish theology that the sufferings of the righteous may atone for the sins of others appears to have influenced primitive-Christian thought.

his second coming he will not act in this capacity, but will come for the salvation of the believers or *them that wait for him*.

The subject of Christ's work as high-priest is continued in xi. 18, and the writer undertakes to show that after all the repeated offerings under the law, sin still remains, for it is impossible that such offerings should effect its removal.

For the law having a shadow of the good things to come, etc. (x. 1).—*The good things* are the blessings of the "everlasting salvation" of which Christ is regarded as the author. They are spoken of as future because their full realisation is conceived as belonging to "the age to come," or the time when Christ shall have returned in glory "unto salvation" for "them that wait for him" (ix. 28). The law has not *the very image* of this redemption because of its imperfections already pointed out, its frequent sacrifices, its changeable priesthood, and its inability effectually to "put away sin" (ix. 26), so that they [the levitical priests] cannot with all their numerous offerings *make perfect them that draw nigh*.

Else would they not have ceased to be offered (x. 2)?—If the sacrifices could have cleansed the worshippers so that they *would have had no more conscience of sins* they would have ceased, or, in other words, would not be continued *year by year* (v. 3).

Take away sins (x. 4).—The doctrine laid down in the preceding verses is thus sententiously confirmed. The blood of the animals mentioned was offered on the day of atonement by the high-priest in the holy of holies.¹ It is

See Weber, *Jüd. Theol.*, chap. xx. The Jewish theological ideas must have been current long before their literary embodiment, and that Jewish-Christian writers of New Testament books should give expression to them is quite natural.

¹ To take away sins (ἀφαιρεῖν ἁμαρτίας) is an intense expression for ἀναφέρειν ἁμαρτίας in ix. 28. Cf. περιτελεῖν ἁμαρτίας (x. 11), and ἀθέτεσις ἁμαρτίας (ix. 26).—"Conscience of sins." συνειδήσις

significant that "cleansing" takes the place of the Pauline "justification"—a post-Pauline soteriological point of view.

*Wherefore, when he [Jesus] cometh into the world (x. 5).—*The writer offers a proof of the proposition contained in verse 4 by the citation of a passage from the Old Testament,¹ in which he supposes Christ to have spoken about his coming into the world to make an offering for sin. The portion of the Psalm from which the quotation is taken is an expression of thanksgiving by the psalmist for help in time of need, and no part of the composition has a "Messianic" reference. The passage on which the entire argument rests, "But a body didst Thou prepare for me" (that is, a "body" in order that an offering might be made by death), is a mistranslation of the Hebrew, which appears in the Septuagint translation followed by the author. Accordingly, the entire quotation is invalidated for his purpose, even if his method of interpretation, which reads into it a reference to Christ, were admissible. In the original Hebrew there is nothing said about a "body," but the psalmist says of himself that God has opened his ears, that is, has made a revelation to him!

*In the roll of the book it is written of me (x. 7).—*This is also a mistranslation of the Hebrew which the writer of the Epistle found in the Septuagint. The psalmist says that he comes before God with the book written in his heart, that is, with the contents of the law written (figuratively) in him. If the writer of the Epistle had been acquainted with Hebrew, and had not depended on a bad translation of the

with the genitive means consciousness of an object. See *συνείδησις τοῦ θεοῦ*, 1 Pet. ii. 19. The writers appear to assume that believers, "cleansed" by the great sacrifice of Christ, would become "perfect," and sin no more. So Paul in his doctrine of atonement makes no provision for sins committed by those who have once been "justified." Theoretically they are saved "once for all."

¹ Ps. xl. 6-8.

Old Testament, he could not have made such a mistake. Besides, if he had taken the trouble to read a little farther in his Septuagint translation of the Psalm, he would have seen the inappropriateness of his reference of the writing to Christ, according to his own idea of his sinlessness. For in verse 12 we read as spoken by the same person whose words are given in *vv.* 6-8: "Mine iniquities have taken hold of me so that I am not able to look up; they are more than the hairs of my head."

He taketh away the first that he may establish the second (x. 9).—This verse is parenthetical, and means that *the first*, or the offering of sacrifices, etc., is taken away in order that *the second*, or the doing of God's will, may be established. The doing of God's will is conceived by the writer as effected by the sacrifice of Christ. This is his interpretation of the passage (Ps. xl. 6-8).

By which will we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all (x. 10).—Because Christ's offering of his body was in accordance with and a fulfilment of the will of God, it is by or in His will that the sanctification of the Christian believers has been effected.¹ This sanctification is regarded as *once for all* time, so that there is no need of other offerings of atonement than that through which it has been obtained.

The doctrine that the sanctification (*ἁγιασμός*) of believers was effected "through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ" is closely related to Paulinism. According to the apostle, Jesus by reason of his atoning sacrifice "was made to us righteousness and sanctification and redemption" (1 Cor. i. 30). An ethical basis, an attainment of holiness by moral struggle and self-conquest, is not implied, but the holy, the saints (*ἅγιοι*) are the believers, the "called," to whom righteousness has been "imputed" for faith. Hence the Corinthians are called "sanctified" and "holy," although the apostle lays not a

¹ So Paul teaches that the purpose of sending Christ in the flesh was that he might make an atoning sacrifice (Gal. iv. 4, 5).

few moral delinquencies to their charge, and declares that they are "carnal," and walk as men. From this point of view the children of a Christian parent are said to be "holy" regardless of their character. This "forensic" justification and holiness are represented in our Epistle, and are evidently regarded as dependent upon the atoning death of Jesus. Yet while in x. 10 and 14 this idea is uppermost, in xii. 14 holiness is represented as an object of pursuit (*διώκετε τὸν ἁγιασμόν*), just as Paul, while theoretically regarding the believers as "saints," finds it necessary to admonish them not to be deficient in moral endeavour.

Dr. Bruce's contention that *ἐν ᾧ θεληματι* means "that it is God's will that sanctifies through the offering" is without exegetical support. The writer does not appear to have thought of the doctrine that Christ's sacrifice possesses sanctifying virtue "because it was a perfect embodiment of the divine righteousness."

In x. 11 and 12 we have nothing but a repetition of what has been said before about the difference between the levitical sacrifices and that of Christ.

From henceforth expecting until his enemies be made the footstool of his feet (x. 13).—*From henceforth* indicates the time from Christ's exaltation "at the right hand of God" to his second coming. Paul says that Christ "must reign until he hath put all enemies under his feet" (1 Cor. xv. 25). This is "at his coming" when they who are his shall be "raised." "Then cometh the end, when he shall deliver up the kingdom to God." "For he must reign," etc. The writer of the Epistle is not, then, in accord with Paul in his doctrine of "the last things," for he places the subjection of the "enemies" of Christ during the time of his sitting at the right hand of God, that is, prior to his second coming.

For by one offering, etc. (x. 14).—*For* connects the clause with verse 12, and the writer wishes to emphasise the teaching that by the *one* sacrifice of Christ ("once for all" time) the holy or the "called" are perfected *forever*. Then follows the citation given in viii. 10 with some verbal

modifications, concluding with *and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more* (x. 17), in order to bring forward again the thought, *perfected forever*. Accordingly, it follows that in the offering of himself by the great high-priest atonement is completed, for where there is remission of sins, *there is no more offering for sin* (x. 18). Here ends the exposition of the work of Christ as high-priest.

At this point the writer resumes the tone of exhortation, and seeks to incite his readers to adherence to the Christian faith, to love, to good works, and to diligent attendance on the religious assemblies (x. 19-25).

Having, therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holy place by the blood of Jesus (x. 19, 20).—A better rendering than *boldness* is “confidence.” Because *by the blood of Jesus* atonement has been made for their sins, the writer exhorts his *brethren* (iii. 1, 12, xiii. 22) to approach God with confidence “with respect to the entrance [literally] of the holy place,” that is, the heavenly sanctuary where God is supposed to dwell, *by the way which he dedicated* [consecrated] *for us, a new and living way*. It is a *living way* because it leads to the “eternal salvation” of the Messianic kingdom.

Through the veil, that is to say, his flesh (x. 20).—A parallel with the tabernacle, in which a veil hung before the holy of holies. The flesh of Christ is compared with this veil which his death is supposed to remove. Perhaps the story of the rending of the veil at the crucifixion of Jesus¹ originated in this conception, probably current at the time of the composition of the first three Gospels and this Epistle.

Over the house of God (x. 21), that is, heaven, since Christ has gone into the heavenly sanctuary.

Our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience (x. 22), that is, by the blood of Christ.²

¹ Matt. xxvii. 51 and parallels.

² See ix. 4, and compare Ex. xxix. 21.

And our bodies washed with pure water (x. 22), that is, of baptism. It does not appear that the writer attached any inward spiritual importance to the baptismal rite. In vi. 2 he mentions it among those "first principles" which he exhorts his readers to leave behind them in order that they "press on to perfection." In the passage at present under consideration he speaks of baptism as a washing of the body with pure water, and definitely contrasts it with the inward sprinkling of the heart from an evil conscience, which, from the analogy of his teaching, we must regard as effected only by the sacrifice of Christ (ix. 14). His idea may have been, as Menegoz supposes, that baptism cleansed the body from "ritual impurities" described in the Levitical law (see ix. 10, 13). "This purification must have had its importance on the one hand for the neophyte himself and on the other for the members of the Jewish-Christian community who then still lived more or less under the influence of their early education and of the traditions of Judaism. The Jews attached an analogous idea to the baptism of proselytes." According to this interpretation our author meant by baptism simply "reception into the church and ritual purification."

For He is faithful who promised (x. 23).—The subject is God,¹ whose fidelity is mentioned as a motive for holding fast to the profession.

And so much the more, as ye see the day drawing nigh (x. 25).—The reference is to the second coming of Christ, the Parousia, "the day" by preëminence, the great day of primitive-Christian hope and expectation, always conceived as near at hand; until its long delay caused a lagging faith to postpone it.² By what signs the readers "see the day drawing nigh" the writer does not intimate.

In connection with the neglect of the religious assemblies the writer now proceeds to admonish his readers against apostasy, and

¹ See 1 Cor. i. 9, x. 13; 1 Thess. v. 24.

² See 2 Thess. ii. 1-12; 2 Pet. iii. 3-10.

to point out the grave peril to which those will be exposed who do not remain loyal to their confession (x. 26-31).

For if we sin wilfully (x. 26).—The *truth* is that of Christianity, a *knowledge* of which probably includes more than a simple apprehension of it. *There remaineth no more a sacrifice for sin.* Their sins having once been “taken away” and the consequences of them disannulled by the atonement of Christ, there is no escape from the divine “vengeance” if they fall again into sin, for since Christ died “once for all” time, he cannot make another propitiation for them, and his original sacrifice is effective but once.

There remains therefore for the apostate only *a certain fearful expectation of judgment and a fierceness of fire which shall devour the adversaries (x. 27).*—*Fierceness of fire* or punitive ardour is an expression intended to convey the writer’s conception of the terrors of the judgment which would fall upon those for whom there was “no more a sacrifice for sin,” and hence no escape from its penalty. The judgment is not defined, and we do not know whether the judge whom he had in mind was God or Christ. The judgment is probably, however, that which was expected at the second coming of Christ. The writer of 2 Thessalonians¹ gives a more definite expression of the nature of the Messianic judgment in terms of “flaming fire,” “vengeance,” and “eternal destruction.”

A man that hath set at naught Moses’ law (x. 28).—By the law of Moses the punishment of death was decreed for certain transgressions.² The *witnesses* against an offender must be “two or three.”³

The *sorer punishment (x. 29)*, inferred by the argument from the less to the greater, is not defined. That it was

¹ 2 Thess. i. 7-10.

² For details the reader may consult Ex. xxi. 15, xxxi. 14; Lev. xvii. 14; Deut. xxii. 22-25.

³ Deut. xvii. 2-7.

conceived as something worse than a cruel death is evident. This section may be interpreted in the light of vi. 4-8, from which we learn that the condition of the apostate is regarded as hopeless, since it is "impossible" to "renew" him "again to repentance."

The word rendered punishment in x. 29 (*τιμωρία*) is not elsewhere used in the New Testament. In the time of Aristotle it was distinguished from *κόλασις* as denoting penalty pure and simple, that is, "with reference to the satisfaction of him who inflicts" and without regard to the good of the sufferer, while the latter included a disciplinary purpose. This distinction must not, however, be pressed, since it is not uniformly supported by usage.

Trodden under foot the Son of God (x. 29).—A vivid figure for scorn and insult.

The blood of the covenant (x. 29), that is, Christ's blood of the New Covenant.

An unholy thing (x. 29).—"Common," not "consecrated," or "unhallowed" were perhaps better. The blood of Christ could be so regarded only by one who did not any longer believe in his atonement, having once been *sanctified* through it.

To do despite unto the Spirit of grace (x. 29) was to treat with contempt the spiritual manifestations or "gifts" which were attributed to a special working of the divine Spirit in the believers.¹

Vengeance belongeth to Me and I will recompense (x. 30).—This is not quoted according to the Septuagint or the Hebrew, although the idea of the original is substantially reproduced.²

The citation is so similar to that made by Paul in Romans xii. 19 that some have argued from the resemblance that the writer borrowed from that Epistle. It cannot, however, be determined whether this

¹ 1 Cor. xii.

² Deut. xxxii. 35.

is the case, or whether both writers borrowed from a Targum which contains the paraphrase, "I will repay," or whether, finally, the expression was a current proverb.

The Lord shall judge His people (x. 30).—See Deut. xxxii. 36 and Ps. cxxxv. 14. The sense of these passages in the original, determined by their connection, is entirely different from that put upon them here. There they mean that God will see that justice is done to His people, and the idea of "vengeance" on evil-doers is not implied.

But call to remembrance the former days (x. 32).—The *great conflict of sufferings* endured *after they were enlightened* doubtless refers to persecutions undergone by the readers as Christians, that is, "enlightened." The word rendered "conflict" (ἀθλησις) is not elsewhere used in the New Testament, but some early-Christian writers employ it with reference to martyrdom.

A better possession and an abiding one (x. 34), that is, the spiritual possessions appertaining to Christianity, "the good things to come" (ix. 11) which the believers were expecting to enjoy when Christ should come again. The condition of Messianic blessedness was not conceived as having an end, hence the term "everlasting"¹ is applied to it, and here the word *abiding*.²

Cast not away, therefore, your boldness (x. 35).—"Fearless confidence" is a better rendering than *boldness*. Confidence in Christ would give them courage to make open confession of him before a scoffing and persecuting world.

Need of patience (x. 36), that is, to persevere in their fidelity to the Master who would soon come to fulfil *the promise* in his kingdom to those who should *have done the will of God*. In order to prove this coming of Christ the writer quotes from Habakkuk ii. 3, 4, prefixing the words,

¹ αἰώνιος.

² Compare Paul's "ever with the Lord," 1 Thess. iv. 17.

“for yet a very little while,” as if they belonged to the text of the prophecy quoted. He was in part misled by the Septuagint, but how nearly he reproduced the original may be seen from the following correct rendering of it by Noyes :

“For the vision is yet for an appointed time,
But it hasteneth to the end ; it shall not deceive ;
If it tarry, wait for it ;
For it shall surely come ; it shall not long delay.
Behold the soul of him that is puffed up shall not be at ease ;
But the just shall live by his faithfulness.”

The expression *shrink back into perdition* (x. 39), referring to apostasy, is derived from the incorrect rendering of the passage from Habakkuk.

But of them that have faith unto the saving of the soul (x. 39), that is, continue in faith until the coming of the Messianic salvation.

Taking his departure from “faith” (x. 39), the writer now proceeds to define it and give examples of its efficacy from the Old Testament history and legend (xi. 1-40).

It is defined as *the assurance of things hoped for, the proving of things not seen* (xi. 1).—The conception is taken from the point of view of the person who has faith, that is from the subjective side, and the sense is “inner confidence in the realisation of the things hoped for.” The second part of the definition means the conviction that the things not seen really exist, as if seen.

Beginning with the assertion that *the elders had witness borne to them* (xi. 2) in the possession of faith, the writer turns aside from the line of illustrations thus indicated to say that *by faith we understand that the worlds have been framed by the word of God*, etc. (xi. 3), thus leaving the realm of things hoped for, etc., as if impelled by a felt necessity of exploiting the Bible history from the beginning. His explanation of the doctrine that *the worlds were framed by*

the word of God by the words, so that what is seen hath not been made out of things which do appear, is an expression of a belief in absolute creation, "creation out of nothing," in other words, and excludes the idea of the foundation or development of the universe out of preëxisting materials.

By faith Abel offered unto God (xi. 4).—On account of Abel's faith his sacrifice was more acceptable to God than Cain's. *Through which he obtained.* Which refers to faith. *That he had witness borne to him that he was righteous* does not appear in the account of the matter in Genesis (iv. 4, 5).¹ *Through his faith, he being dead yet speaketh.*

The translation of Enoch is regarded as occurring on account of his "faith" (xi. 5), which the author finds him to have possessed because he *was well-pleasing unto God. He was not found.* These words are adopted from the Septuagint, and are not in the Hebrew.² The legend of Enoch's "translation" rests upon the words, "and he was not, for God took him."

Enoch's "faith," however, appears to have consisted only in believing that God exists and *is the rewarder of them that diligently seek after Him (xi. 6).*

Noah is spoken of as having *condemned the world (xi. 7)*, that is, by his example of *godly fear* and faith. Through the latter he is regarded as having become *an heir of the righteousness which is according to faith*, that is, the righteousness which is acquired by means of faith. The writer's conception of faith as related to righteousness is not that of Paul, and he does not employ the Pauline terms in reference to it. But "righteousness according to faith" is here mentioned as though it were a doctrine known to the writer and perhaps to his readers. (See the discussion of the doctrine at the end of the Commentary on the Epistle.)

The faith of Abraham and Sarah is next cited (xi. 8-13). The faith of the former *looked for the city which hath the*

¹ See Matt. xxiii. 35; 1 John iii. 12.

² Gen. v. 22-24.

foundations (is abiding), *whose builder and maker is God*, that is, the heavenly Jerusalem (xii. 22, xiii. 14) which the Jews believed would descend from heaven at the appearance of the Messiah. The early Christians adopted this idea, and connected the descent of the new Jerusalem with the second coming of Christ.¹ *As the stars of heaven in multitude and as the sand* (xi. 12). See Gen. xiii. 16.

These all died in faith (xi. 13).—Because it belongs essentially to faith that its possessor must be without the seeing and enjoyment of “the things hoped for.” *Strangers and pilgrims*. See Gen. xxiii. 4.

For they that say such things (xi. 14).—The writer reads his own ideas of the heavenly country into the Old Testament record, and assumes that a patriarch could not declare himself a sojourner and pilgrim in a land without reference to a heavenly abode in the future. The reasoning that because they did not return to the *country from which they went out*, they must have had a celestial one in mind, is anything but historical.

For He hath prepared for them a city (xi. 16).—The city in question is the heavenly Jerusalem (verse 10).

From whence he did also in a parable receive him back (xi. 19).—The interpretation on which this translation as well as that of the old version rests presupposes that the Greek expression (ἐν παραβολῇ) means “in a figure” or “figuratively” (Noyes). But it is wholly a matter of conjecture to what the “figure” refers, if this is the correct rendering. If we suppose the term to mean the opposite of “actually” in the sense that Abraham did not really receive Isaac back from death, but only “as it were,” it is surprising and quite improbable that the writer should have employed the words in question to express this idea. The supposition that the expression means “as a type,” that is, of the resurrection, is exposed to the difficulty that the writer has omitted to

¹ Rev. iii. 12, xxi. 2-27.

indicate what in his mind the receiving back was a type of. A writer whose typology is so clearly defined as his would not be likely to make such an omission. Another objection to this rendering is that in every other place in the Epistle where the word rendered "whence" (*ὁθεν*) is used it signifies "wherefore."¹ This is probably the signification here. Now the word rendered "parable" sometimes means "a venture," "a risk," "a committing" or "giving up," and the passage probably means: "Wherefore [on account of trusting in God who is able to raise the dead] he received him back even in giving him up."

Even concerning things to come (xi. 20), that is, the coming fortunes of the sons.

And worshipped leaning upon the top of his staff (xi. 21).—See Gen. xlviii. 21 for the account of Jacob's blessing. These words are added to the text from Genesis xlvii. 31, where in the Septuagint they are an incorrect rendering of the Hebrew, which reads, "and Israel bowed himself on the head of the bed."

Accounting the reproaches of Christ (xi. 26).—The meaning of this passage is doubtful. The writer's fondness for types favours the interpretation, "typically of Christ," on the ground that the sufferings of the people of God in Old Testament times foreshadowed, as was supposed, those of Jesus. But if this be the meaning, the writer has unusually for him concealed the type. The sense, "for the sake of Christ," by reason of his hope in the Messiah, has the simple genitive of the construction against it. Perhaps the best interpretation is that the writer conceived Moses to have suffered in his time such shame as Christ suffered at the hands of his enemies.²

For he looked unto the recompense of reward (xi. 26).—It was for the sake of the "reward" that he was faithful in

¹ ii. 17, iii. 1, vii. 25, ix. 18. ² See xiii. 13; 2 Cor. i. 5; Col. i. 24.

suffering. The reward which the writer had in mind was that of "eternal salvation," and he ascribes to Moses without regard to historical considerations both the motive and the hope by which he himself was actuated.

As seeing Him who is invisible (xi. 27).—He was steadfast as if the invisible God were revealed to his inward vision, and had faith in the "things not seen."

Kept the passover (xi. 28).—Better, "instituted the passover." *And the sprinkling of blood*, that is, on the door-posts.¹

The walls of Jericho fell down (xi. 30).—In the legend of the fall of Jericho the people of Israel are represented as having faith in the directions which Jehovah is said to have given for effecting the overthrow of the city.²

By faith Rahab the harlot perished not (xi. 31).—Rahab's faith appears from the story to have consisted in believing that the God of the Israelites would give them "the land"³ and accordingly that He was mightier than the opposing gods. Therefore, she gave protection to the emissaries whom she supposed to have come from Him, on condition that she and her household should be protected at the capture of the city.⁴ Her protection of the spies, which was effected by a falsehood, was, according to the story, duly rewarded.⁵

Obtained promises (xi. 33).—This may mean simply *promises* or things promised. Verse 39 is opposed to the latter sense, if the things promised are other than worldly possessions. The idea that "Messianic promises" are meant is rather far-sought.

Women received their dead by resurrection (xi. 35).—Reference is perhaps had to the stories in 1 Kgs. xvii. 17-22, and 2 Kgs. iv. 17-35.

That they might obtain a better resurrection (xi. 35).—In 2

¹ See Ex. xii. 7, 22.

³ *Ibid.* ii. 9.

² Josh. vi.

⁴ *Ibid.* ii. 12.

⁵ *Ibid.* vi. 22, 23.

Maccabees, vii. 9, 11, 14, 20, 23, Jews are represented as enduring torture and death for their religion in the hope of *resurrection*, belief in which was current in later Judaism. The writer quotes his examples of faith without discrimination from apocryphal as well as canonical books (*xvi.* 36-39).

Stoned and sawn asunder (xi. 37).—See 2 Chron. xxiv. 20-22. According to tradition Isaiah was *sawn asunder*.

Received not the promise (xi. 40).—The promised blessing came only in Christianity, the consummation of which was believed to be the second coming of Christ, or the Messianic salvation, the “eternal salvation” of “the age to come.”

Without us, that is, without our participation. There seems to be implied here the belief that at the second coming of Christ the righteous dead of the Old Testament times would be raised to share in the Messianic blessedness.¹

The note or exhortation which had been suspended during this digression on faith is now resumed, and the readers are urged to endure with patience the trials to which they are subject, considering the multitude of witnesses who have suffered and triumphed through faith, and looking especially to Jesus, who after enduring the cross has sat down at the right hand of God (xii. 1-13).

Witnesses are not to be understood as people looking on, but as those who have borne testimony. The persons mentioned in chapter xi. are meant.

Lay aside every weight and the sin (xii. 1).—The writer had in mind the runner in the games, who divested himself of all that would hinder him in the race. If he had any particular encumbrance or sin in mind he does not specify it.

Jesus, the author and perfecter of our faith (xii. 2), that is, to whom is due the beginning of our Christian faith, and who will bring it to completion in us. *Who for the joy that was set before him*, that is, the heavenly felicity which would

¹ See note on ix. 15.

be the reward for his sacrifice. The writer attributes this hedonistic motive to Jesus from his own ethical point of view.

Gainsaying of sinners against themselves (xii. 3).—The reading on which the translation “themselves” is based has some good authorities in its favour, but is to be rejected in favour of that which gives “himself” in the English translation. *Resisted unto blood* (xii. 4).—Their conflict against sin, that is, against the sin of apostasy to which their trials might tempt them, had not yet required them to shed their blood as martyrs. The words translated *have resisted* and *striving against* are not elsewhere found in the New Testament, and are probably borrowed from the contests in boxing.¹

And ye have forgotten (xii. 5).—The opinion that this clause should be punctuated as a question has in its favour the judgment that as an assertion it has more harshness than the context requires. The quotation is from Proverbs iii. 11, 12, according to the Septuagint which is slightly different from the Hebrew.

It is for chastening that ye endure (xii. 7).—The trials which the readers endure are for their discipline. The idea contained in *chastening* is not that of penalty, but that of “training,” “education,” intended to result in “an increase of virtue.” It is such treatment as a wise father may give his children. Hence the remark: *God dealeth with you as with sons*. The reading which allows the translation: “If ye endure chastening, God dealeth with you as sons,” is supported by some authorities. From this point of view God’s dealing with men would be conceived to depend on their patience under affliction. In any case, it is with *believers* that the writer represents God as dealing like a father. He is not speaking of the universal fatherhood of God, and the

¹ ἀντιμαχίστημι and ἀνταγωνίζομαι. See 1 Cor. ix, 26, *πυκτενω*, “so fight [box] I not as one beating the air.”

“ sons ” are those who are spiritually such by reason of their belief in Christ.¹

Whereof all have been made partakers (xii. 8).—All refers to those received as sons (verse 6). The perfect tense (“ have been made ”) requires some such limitation.

Then are ye bastards, and not sons (xii. 8).—The fact that God chastens them, the writer tells his readers, is an evidence that He recognises them as sons in the sense mentioned. The implication is that the welfare of spiritual *bastards*, who, of course, are such by their own choice, would not so much concern Him that He would subject them to discipline.

And live (xii. 9), that is, enjoy the “ eternal life ” of “ the age to come.”²

That which is lame, etc. (xii. 13), that is, the Christian believer who limps in his course, and is in danger of apostasy.

Follow after, etc. (xii. 14), endeavour to acquire. *Sanctification* is purification in general ethically regarded. All are also exhorted to *look carefully* after the spiritual welfare of their brethren. *Lest any root of bitterness spring up* (xii. 15), that is, a man arise among the believers whose unholy walk and conversation should yield the bitter fruit of defilement to the many. See Deut. xxix. 18 ; 1 Macc. i. 10, and “ the peaceable fruit of righteousness ” verse 11 of this chapter.

The peril of *falling short of the grace of God* (xii. 15) is made vivid by citing the case of Esau³ who *was rejected when he desired to inherit the blessing* (xii. 17).—The point of the warning is in the implication that a believer who should “ fall away ” (vi. 6) would be rejected from the Messianic kingdom of “ the age to come,” just as Esau was refused the “ blessing.”

Like Esau such an one would be able to *find no place for repentance* (xii. 17), in accordance with the writer’s doctrine

¹ See John i. 12 ; Rom. viii. 14 ; Phil. ii. 15.

² Rom. viii. 13 ; 2 Tim. ii. 11.

³ Gen. xxvii.

that God accepts no second repentance, and that Jesus' sacrifice for sin avails but once (vi. 4-8, x. 26-31). The objection to this interpretation that it places the writer in disagreement with the Christian doctrine, apparently implied in Luke xxiii. 39-43, that it is never too late to repent, is without force, since it is a gratuitous assumption that he must be in accord with every New Testament teaching. He is not in agreement with the Old Testament account, which contains no mention of Esau's seeking repentance "with tears." Indeed it does not appear from that narrative that Isaac was unwilling to bless him because he had sold his birthright.¹

The interpretation is without warrant which removes from "repentance" its ethical significance and applies it to Isaac in the sense of a change of mind, thus giving the meaning that Isaac could not be induced to recall the blessing which he had conferred upon Jacob and give it to Esau. A writer intending to express this idea would not have used the words with reference to Esau, "he found no place for repentance." There is also no ground for referring "it" in the phrase "he sought it," to "blessing" instead of to "repentance." These expedients, devised in order to soften the harshness of the teaching of the passage, are without exegetical support. It is also to read into the passage an unnatural meaning to assume that the writer refers only to apostasy in the sense of a change of ecclesiastical relations, as, if a Protestant should pass to the Catholic Church and return to his former communion, he would never lapse again to Catholicism!

For ye are not come unto a mount, etc. (xii. 18).—The word translated *mount* is not found in the best Greek manuscripts, but should probably be supplied on account of "Mount Zion" (verse 22). The literal rendering is not *might be touched*, but simply *touched*. The writer intends to contrast this palpable mountain, Sinai, with the spiritual, "heavenly" Jerusalem. On vv. 19-21 see Exodus xix.

But ye are come unto Mount Zion (xii. 22).—The writer

¹ Gen. xxvii. 4.

tells his readers that in coming into the Christian faith and communion they have entered upon relations belonging to a new dispensation, and have gained a spiritual fellowship, the supersensible qualities of which he sets forth with great rhetorical force. 'The "heavenly Jerusalem" which will be their abode is called Mount Zion according to Old Testament usage which represents Zion as the abode of God.'

To the general assembly and Church of the firstborn who are enrolled in heaven (xii. 23).—The word rendered *general assembly* means a festal or joyous gathering, and by *the firstborn* is probably meant the righteous of the Old Testament times (xi. 40).

The spirits of just men made perfect (xii. 23).—*Spirits* probably designates the dead not yet clothed upon with the new resurrection-body.² And the writer perhaps had in mind the Christians who had died, and who, still in the underworld, might be regarded as constituting a part of the great Christian fellowship.

And to the blood of sprinkling (xii. 24), that is, the atoning blood of Christ (ix. 13-15; x. 22).

See that ye refuse not Him that speaketh, etc. (xii. 25), that is, God. The readers are admonished not to reject the divine word now in the Christian dispensation spoken *from heaven*, since Jesus was sent thence, for if those who refused him who gave the earthly warning through Moses did not escape retribution, much less will those escape who disregard this celestial admonition.

*Whose voice then shook the earth (xii. 26.)*³—*But now hath He promised.* The shaking must, of course, be greater *now*, that is, under the New Covenant, since this surpasses the Old. The reference is probably to the great convulsion

¹ Ps. xlviii. 2, 3, 1. 2. According to the Jewish theology the Jerusalem which is above (Gal. iv. 26) would in the Messianic age descend upon the renewed earth. Weber, *Jüd. Theol.*, p. 404.

² 1 Pet. iii. 19; Luke xxiv. 39.

³ See Ex. xix. 18.

which was looked for at the second coming of Christ,¹ though the passage quoted² relates to the time of rebuilding the temple.

The writer understands *yet once more* (xii. 27) to imply "and not again." Accordingly he thinks that in that great convulsion *the things that are shaken*, that is, *things made*, will be removed, in accordance with the idea that when Christ should come in his Messianic kingdom the existing earth and heavens would give place to "new heavens and a new earth."³ *That those things that are not shaken may remain*, that is, the blessedness, the life, and the joys of this kingdom.

Wherefore, receiving a kingdom that cannot be shaken (xii. 28).—As "heavenly," the kingdom of the "age to come" is conceived to be permanent and "eternal." It is believed to be so near and so certain to come that the writer employs the present participle *receiving*.

For our God is a consuming fire (xii. 29).—The English translation does not give the full force of the original, which is, "For our God is *also* a consuming fire," that is, He is not only a God of grace, but also a God of penal justice.⁴

The Epistle closes with exhortations, admonitions, and greetings (xiii. 1-25).

Entertained angels unawares (xiii. 2).—What legend concerning angels *entertained unawares* by men the writer had in mind, is not certain; perhaps that in Genesis xviii. 19. The motive presented for hospitality is that of reward.

As bound with them (xiii. 3).—This fine sentiment reminds us of Paul's teaching in 1 Cor. xii. 26.

God will judge (xiii. 4), that is, probably, will exclude from the coming Messianic kingdom.⁵

¹ Mark xiii. 25.

² Hag. ii. 6.

⁴ x. 30; Rom. xii. 19; Deut. iv. 24.

³ 2 Pet. iii. 12, 13; Rev. xxi. 1. ⁵ 1 Cor. vi. 9; Rev. xxii. 15.

Be free from the love of money (xiii. 5). There are several Old Testament expressions similar to the citation, *I will in no wise fail*, etc.; but Philo has precisely the same words, and they may have been quoted from his writings or they may have been a current expression known to both.

So that we may boldly say (xiii. 6).—See Ps. cxviii. 6. *Remember them that had the rule over you* (xiii. 7).—The reference is to former leaders or officers and teachers. *The issue of their lives*, probably martyrdom rendered their *faith* worthy of imitation.

Jesus Christ is the same, etc. (xiii. 8).—The connection of this verse is obscure. If it is closely connected with verse 7 the meaning would appear to be that he in whom the departed rulers believed is the same and always will be the same as an object of faith. If the connection is with verse 9 it prepares the way for the injunction to give place to no "strange teachings," because Jesus, the great head of all believers, is forever the same.

The *divers and strange teachings* (xiii. 9) refer to disputes about foods, probably to flesh offered in sacrifice.

We have an altar (xiii. 10).—The altar of the Christians is spoken of in a figure, and the reference is to the sacrifice of Christ often mentioned in the Epistle. The eating of the offering made upon this altar is the enjoyment of the advantages, which belong to the Christian alone, of the sacrifice in question. The two following verses (11 and 12) are intended to show in accordance with the fundamental doctrine of the Epistle that the New Testament covenant with its great sacrifice was typified by the Hebrew offering on the day of atonement.

For we have not here an abiding city (xiii. 14).—See xii. 22.—*Through him [Christ] let us then*, etc. (xiii. 15).—A spiritual *sacrifice of praise* is becoming to Christians who should have a better offering than Jews.

But to do good and to communicate forget not (xiii. 16).—

This fine teaching, quite in the spirit of Jesus, that men ought themselves to make sacrifices for the sake of sweet charity, furnishes an agreeable relief to a disquisition whose monotonous refrain is salvation through the sacrifice of the great high-priest who "entered into the sanctuary with his own blood." This direct way into the holy of holies, which men may tread without priestly intervention, was shown by the great Teacher, to whom the thought of the salvation of men through the functions of a high-priesthood was as remote and foreign as that of their immediate relation to the Father was inmost and essential.¹

That I may be restored to you the sooner (xiii. 19).—An expression of a belief in the efficacy of prayer with respect to external results. The passage implies that the writer was detained at a distance from his readers, whether forcibly or by circumstances is not apparent. He may have been in exile. Restoration implies either that he was a member of the Church to which his readers belonged, or that he had formerly visited them. That he was free to do so is implied in verse 23.

Who brought again from the dead (xiii. 20).—A reference to the resurrection of Jesus without the Pauline doctrinal implications.² *Shepherd of the sheep* (Matt. xxvi. 31; John x. 11; 1 Pet. ii. 25).

With the blood of the eternal covenant (xiii. 20).—The sense in which the preposition here rendered *with* (ἐν) is to be taken is obscure. Perhaps "in virtue of" or "on the strength of" may give the author's thought. Jesus was

¹ Luke xv. 11-24.

² It is worthy of note that the Epistle contains only this incidental mention of the resurrection of Jesus, which is one of the cardinal doctrines of the Pauline theology. In Paul the earthly atoning work of Christ is paramount, and his death would have had no significance without his resurrection (Rom. i. 4), while in Hebrews the emphasis falls upon his high-priestly function in heaven.

raised from the dead because, according to the author's general theory respecting his death, he was to enter "with his blood into the heavenly sanctuary." This was to the writer the chief reason for the mission of Christ and his real work. Hence his resurrection had its ground in his blood, or *in the blood of the eternal covenant*.

Timothy (xiii. 23), about whose imprisonment we know nothing from other sources, having been set at liberty, the writer informs his readers that with him he will shortly visit them.

They of Italy salute you (xiii. 24), that is, persons from Italy who were at the time of writing in company with the author, perhaps Christians who had fled from persecution.

THE DOCTRINAL TEACHINGS OF THE EPISTLE.

The relation of Judaism and Christianity in the thought of the author is the point of view from which the doctrines of the Epistle may best be regarded. He sets the two systems of religion in strong contrast, but not in fundamental opposition. He evidently had not outgrown Judaism and left it far behind him. He regards the two "covenants" as grounded upon the same principle, that of sacrifice for the "putting away" of sin. They differ in the incidental particular that the sacrifices of the one are temporary, perishable, ineffectual, and earthly, while that of the other is permanent, "once for all" time, eternal, and heavenly. The one furnishes only a type and shadow, a ministry sanctifying only to "the cleanness of the flesh" (ix. 13), the other is a fulfilment in the celestial sanctuary, and its ministration "cleanses the conscience from dead works." The principle of the high-priesthood is at the basis of both, and the office has an unbroken continuity passing from a state of imperfection in the one to divine completeness in the other. The Old Testament is interpreted as containing in symbol and foreshadowing all that is essential in Christianity. Even the descent of the high-priesthood of the latter is traced from the former, Melchizedek, a high-priest forever, being regarded as a type of Christ.

The doctrine of the Epistle concerning the person of Christ denotes a marked departure from the earlier writings of the New Testament. As the Son of God he is "appointed heir of all things," is the one through whom, by whose agency as a preëxistent being, God "made the ages," or the world in its past, present, and future conditions, "the effulgence of His glory, and the very image of His substance." He is omnipotent, "upholding all things by the word of his power" (i. 2, 3). He is exalted above the angels, who must worship him, and the epithet "god" is applied to him (i. 6, 8). Paul taught the pre-existence of Christ, in which state he was the agent of creation, but he was ever to him in a unique sense human, the "heavenly man," the "second Adam," "the second man." In the apostle's

thought Jesus was never separated from humanity, however exalted he might be both in his preëxistent state and after his resurrection. His "body of glory," which he was conceived to possess in both conditions, was the pattern for that with which the believers would be clothed when they should rise at his second coming (Phil. iii. 21). Accordingly he never applies such terms to him as are employed in i. 2, 3. The Pauline idea that Christ was the "image of God"¹ falls short in intensity of that of our author, "the very image of His substance." Paul calls Christ "a life-giving spirit"² in connection with his function in salvation as "the last Adam," a representative of the human race in a saving and spiritual capacity, as the first Adam was conceived as its representative with respect to the flesh and sin. But the author of Hebrews attributes to him a participation in the divine essence, when he declares that he effected an atonement by virtue of "eternal spirit" which he is assumed to be or to possess (ix. 14). As a godlike being, "eternal spirit," he "appears before the face of God" (ix. 24) to make propitiation in the heavenly sanctuary. With all this exaltation of Christ, however, the writer evidently thought of him as subordinated to the Deity. It is God who "made the ages" (worlds), and the Son is only an agent. He from whom and through whom are all things subjected Jesus to suffering (ii. 10), and made him "for a little while lower than the angels." The writer's doctrine of the person of Christ represents a stage in the process of the glorification of Jesus traceable in primitive Christianity. This process began with Paul and ended in the fourth Gospel. Hebrews is between the two, but nearer to the latter than to the former.

The preëxistent Christ is conceived as a divine being, but not as God. If this distinction is not precisely defined, and if no very clear idea is expressed in "the effulgence of His glory and the very image of His person," it is evident that such a discrimination is implied in several passages of the Epistle. The writer classes Christ in the preëxistent state as one of certain superior beings who are called his "fellows" (i. 9), and whom he outranks, having been "anointed above" them. The monotheism of the Epistle is incontestable, and its God is the God of the Hebrew theology, the sole Sovereign and Creator. Christ is not regarded as self-existent, but as derived, generated, dependent, as "better than the angels," as the begotten Son (i. 2, 4, 5). The words "without father," etc., and "without beginning of days" (vii. 3), simply indicate that the writer did not conceive

¹ 2 Cor. iv. 4.

² 1 Cor. xv. 45.

of Christ as having begun to exist when he was born as a man. In his essential existence he will have no "end of life" (vii. 3, 16). The rank of the Son is accordingly divine. But though he is designated as "god" in the citation from Ps. xlv., just as Philo regarded the Logos as a second god, he is subordinated to the Deity, who in the same passage is called his God, at whose right hand he is elsewhere represented as seated (i. 3, 13, viii. 1, x. 12, xii. 2) and accordingly as holding a rank inferior to the "Majesty on high." As a "mediator" (viii. 6, ix. 15), then, Christ is conceived by our author as a pre-existent being superior to the angels and less than God. The incarnation was not an incarnation of Deity, who, according to the Alexandrian philosophy with which the Epistle is in touch, could not come into immediate contact with matter. As to the manner of the birth of the man Jesus there is no indication in the Epistle of the author's belief in the miraculous conception. From his point of view that Christ was the preëxistent glorious Son, the "very image" of God, such an idea would be as incongruous as it apparently was to Paul and the author of the fourth Gospel. In emphasising the earthly example of Christ the author differs from Paul, and even goes so far as to teach that the exalted being who was the "effulgence" of the divine "glory" in his preëxistence was made perfect only through "sufferings" (ii. 10). The teaching, however, which exalts Christ even beyond the Pauline conception, and constitutes a "preparation of the Johannine Christology," must be regarded as "the central doctrine" of the Epistle, whose real theme is the superiority of the new covenant to the old. To this superiority a divine high-priest was essential.

The work of Jesus as a Saviour is inseparably associated in the mind of the writer with the function of a high-priest in the heavenly sanctuary. How he conceived this celestial, divine personality to have assumed a human body and to have entered upon conditions in which he was "tempted" and perfected through suffering, is not apparent; and he offers no solution of the difficulty which lies in the supposition that so exalted a being as he assumes Christ to have been in his pre-existence should have "learned obedience" on earth. That Jesus should, however, "be made in all respects like unto his brethren" (ii. 17) so as to be capable of being "touched with a feeling of our infirmities" (iv. 15), was evidently regarded by the writer as an indispensable intermediate stage between his preëxistent condition and that to which he was exalted when he "sat down at the right hand of God" (i. 3, viii. 1, x. 12, xii. 2). This earthly life of temptation

and suffering was deemed a preparation for his function as a high-priest, which was conceived to be performed not in "a holy place made with hands," but in "heaven itself" (ix. 24). Essentially it was to "offer a sacrifice for sins forever" (x. 12), the effect of which was "remission" of sins (x. 18), or release from the penalty incurred by the commission of them, without which there "remains" only a "fearful expectation of judgment and a fierceness of fire which shall devour the adversaries" (x. 27). In this doctrine of atonement we have neither the thought nor the terminology of Paul. Instead of "the man from heaven," the "last Adam" who as the representative of mankind redeemed them in his death from the "curse of the law," "became a curse for us,"¹ satisfied the penal demands of the law for all, and so became "the end of the law" (Rom. x. 4.), doing it away so that it "passeth" with all its glory,² we have in Hebrews a great high-priest who with his own blood expiates the sins of men, appearing with it before the face of God for them as an intercessor (ix. 11-15, 24-27, x. 10). The destruction of the devil (ii. 14) takes the place of the abolition of the law. Instead of the Pauline "justification" of those who believe, we have here the ideas of "cleansing" and "making perfect" (ix. 14, xi. 40, xii. 23). This sacrifice, made "once for all" time, secures an "eternal redemption" (ix. 12, 25-28). The real atonement of Christ is not, as with Paul, in the death on the cross, but in his entrance into the perfect sanctuary above, he having "passed through the heavens" (iv. 14, ix. 11, x. 12).

The writer of the Epistle lays no little stress upon faith, but his apprehension of it is different from Paul's. The Pauline opposition of faith and works, the conception of justification by faith, and of faith as a means of mystic union with Christ are not found in the Epistle. Unlike Paul, the writer does not give prominence to faith in Christ, but rather in God, when he does not, as is often the case, speak quite vaguely of it. Christ is the example of faith, its "author and perfecter" (xii. 2). The emphasis placed upon faith does not relate to the individual appropriation of the atoning sacrifice of Christ, but to a continuance in the Christian life. Through the new covenant free access to God is offered to all who will "draw nigh" (ii. 9, iv. 16, vii. 19, 25, x. 20). Christ is even the author of eternal salvation *to all who obey him* (v. 9), and instead of men being accounted righteous through faith in the Pauline sense, we have "*wrought* righteousness through faith" (xi. 13). Far from being a specifically Christian dis-

¹ Gal. iii. 13.

² 2 Cor. iii. 11.

position, it is the attitude of mind to which were due the achievements of a long line of Old Testament worthies (xi.). Not only is it "the assurance of things hoped for" (xi. 1), but it is intimately associated with obedience, fidelity, and patience. In making "the things not seen" its object the writer reveals the influence of the Alexandrian conception that all that is real and abiding belongs to the future world, and will be enjoyed by men only when it is opened to them. Instead of the Pauline teaching that righteousness is accounted to one through faith he teaches that through it one may have "witness" that he is righteous (xi. 4), and in the case of Abraham he goes no farther than to say that he "obeyed" by faith (xi. 8), and "offered up Isaac" "accounting that God was able to raise him up" (xi. 17, 19).

"The subjective side of the attainment of salvation, in marked contrast with the juridical as well as the mystically disposed theory of Paul, simply takes this form, that the free access procured by the high-priestly service of Christ accrues to the advantage of all those who employ the same in order to approach God (iv. 16, vii. 19, 25) and to serve Him." Apparently without comprehension of, or at least without interest in, the profound mystical doctrine of faith set forth by the apostle, the author appears to have "returned to the popular apprehension of the ethical relations as they prevailed in all Jewish and gentile circles." It was the fortune of the central ideas of Paulinism to serve only a temporary purpose, and that in the great conflict which their author waged with Judaism. The invasion of Hellenistic ideas pushed aside the "Pharisaic juridical conceptions" contained in his theology, and "gave it a turn by means of which it was better capable of finding acceptance and comprehension in the gentile world." The faith which Hebrews presents and illustrates has been well characterised as having significance rather for the promotion than for the grounding of salvation. It is almost identified with patience and endurance, and sometimes scarcely distinguished from obedience and simple fidelity. It is specifically declared to be the assurance of things hoped for and the conviction of things not seen—an idea which is "more Philonic than Pauline." It is related also to the future world, the only real world according to the Alexandrian philosophy of the author of the Epistle. The central idea of faith as it is set forth here is belief in God, His existence, and the certainty of the rewards which He dispenses (vi. 10, xi. 6). It does not occur to the writer to speak after the manner of Paul of faith in the grace of God manifested in the death of Christ, but rather in the

spirit of Hebrew piety and in the form of Alexandrian philosophy he gives expression to the faith through which "we understand that the worlds were made by the word of God" (xi. 3). Jesus is not so much the object of faith as its author, its finisher, and its example (xii. 2, 3). "By faith Abraham being tried offered up Isaac" (xi. 17), but the Pauline idea that the patriarch's faith was accounted to him for righteousness¹ is foreign to the writer's thought. Paul's "righteousness which is *of* faith" (Rom. iv. 13, xi. 30) becomes here the "righteousness which is *according to* faith" (xi. 7). No moral or religious value is attached to faith in doctrines or in sacraments, and the Eucharist is not mentioned.

The doctrine of "the last things" or the second coming of Christ occupies no important place in the Epistle. Mention of it is incidental, and very little is said of resurrection and judgment. They are, indeed, disparaged as "first principles" beyond which the readers are exhorted to press on (vi. 1, 2). But the writer clearly marks the distinction between the present and future times or periods, between "this age" and "that which is to come," and regards the hopes of Christians as directed toward the great consummation of the Messianic age which he represents as near at hand (x. 25). Those who believe and remain steadfast will be partakers of the blessedness of the kingdom about to be established. For apostates there is no hope, and in the fortune of those who have not believed no interest is manifested. There is an intimation that those Jews who in the Old Testament times were examples of faith might be made perfect along with the Christians, but the writer expresses no concern about Jews who did not have faith, much less about the multitudes of other men who had never heard of Judaism or of Christianity.

¹ Rom. iv. 9.

THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

INTRODUCTION.

COLOSSÆ was a city of Phrygia, a country through which Paul is reported to have passed twice in his missionary travels.¹ There is no evidence that he had anything to do with the establishment of the church in Colossæ or, indeed, that he ever visited that city. The Epistle purporting to have been written by the apostle to this church proceeds, after the salutation and some hearty expressions of thanks to God for the faith and love of the Colossians, directly to an elaboration of the mystery of the person of Christ (i. 16-20). After referring to his own appointment as a minister of the gospel, he enters upon the real purpose of the writing, which was to warn the readers against certain erroneous doctrines (ii. 1-iii. 4). Following this are exhortations to avoid all uncleanness, anger, malice, and falsehood, and to "put on a heart of compassion, kindness," etc. (iii. 5-17). Wives are enjoined to be in subjection to their husbands, husbands to love their wives, and servants to obey their masters (iii. 18-iv. 6). The conclusion connects the Epistle with that to Philemon in the mention of Onesimus, who is said to be sent by the writer to Colossæ together with Tychicus.² Greet-

¹ Acts xvi. 6, xviii. 23.

² *Ibid.* xx. 4.

ings are sent from Aristarchus, Mark, Epaphras, Luke, and Demas, as in Philemon, and the readers are asked to cause that the letter be read to the brethren in Laodicea and to read the one from that church.

The Epistle, unlike the undisputed writings of Paul, appears to have exerted no influence upon other New Testament writers. Conceptions of the person of Christ closely related to those contained in it are found in Hebrews, Revelation, and the Pastoral Epistles, but there is no evidence of a literary dependence of the authors of these writings upon it. The same is substantially true of the fourth Gospel. The single exception to the foregoing statement is furnished in the Epistle to the Ephesians, the relation of which to Colossians will be considered when we come to treat of it in due course. No certain trace of it is found in the apostolic fathers, and in Justin Martyr (about A.D. 150) two or three expressions appear which may be reminiscences of it. The heretic Marcion recognised it about the middle of the second century, and later Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian.

The object of the Epistle, which was addressed to gentile Christians (i. 21, ii. 11, 13) and to persons not acquainted with the writer (ii. 1), was to warn the readers against false teachings presented through "philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ" (ii. 8). The question of the authorship is inseparably bound up with the determination of the character of these errors. If they were such as might have existed and been promulgated in Colossæ in the time of Paul, then he may have written the Epistle as we have it, so far as this matter is concerned. But the allusions to the heresies mentioned are too vague to enable us to decide beyond doubt regarding their character and to connect them certainly with known historical aberrations of doctrine in the primitive Church. Some of them do not carry us beyond

Jewish prescripts regarding food, drink, and festivals. Such "rudiments of the world" (ii. 8, 20) are mentioned in Galatians¹ and Romans.² Others indicate teachings which cannot be classified with these, and appear to refer to dualistic-ascetic tendencies ("severity to the body," ii. 23) according to which man by reason of his fleshly nature is unworthy (see "humility," ii. 23) to hold intercourse with the Deity, and must invoke the intervention of angels, who thus become objects of worship (ii. 18). Thus they fail to "hold fast the Head," Christ (ii. 19). There is perhaps a reference to Gnostic speculations and pride of wisdom in the declaration that in Christ "are all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge [Gnosis] hidden" (ii. 3). It appears very probable that the writer was contending against teachings which were a combination of Essenism with Gnosticism in its early stages. But a precise historical determination of the errors in question is not possible.

The contest against false doctrines is conducted from the point of view of a doctrine of the person of Christ intended to counteract them. Accordingly, the section, i. 15-20, may be regarded as the kernel of the Epistle, furnishing, as it does, the basis of the argument in refutation of the heresies. A study of this section will show the close connection of the writer's thought with that of Hebrews and its wide departure from the doctrines of Paul as known from his great Epistles. The ideas appear to be those of the apostle developed in a mind influenced by the speculations of Philo of Alexandria. Paul, indeed, calls Christ "the image of God,"³ but here we have him designated as "the image of the invisible God" (i. 15), according to Philo's conception of God as concealed, and made known only by the Logos. Such an expression used of Christ as "the firstborn of all creation" is as remote from Paul's "the firstborn among many brethren" as it is closely related to Philo's idea that the

¹ Gal. iv. 3, 9, 10.² Rom. xiv. 5, 6, 17, 21.³ 2 Cor. iv. 4.

Logos was the firstborn or oldest Son of God. The teaching that through Christ and "unto him" were all things created, "whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers," that is, angelic beings (i. 16), is not only quite unlike what the apostle says in 1 Corinthians viii. 6, but appears to be directed against the false teachers who depreciated Christ in favour of angel-worship. The saying that "in him all things consist" (i. 17) reminds us of Hebrews i. 3, but of nothing that is unquestionably Pauline. Whether the term "fulness" ¹ refers to a Gnostic doctrine or no, the teaching that in Christ "dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily" is not only unlike Paul, but is irreconcilable with his conception of Christ as the typical human personality, "the man from heaven," who preëxisted as the archetype of the human race, in order that in the scheme of redemption he might, as "the last Adam," be the representative of men. Paul knew of Christ as the Saviour of men alone, but the author of Colossians extends the redemptive efficacy of Jesus to "things in the heavens" (i. 20), that is, to supernal orders of beings. Paul's doctrine of the atonement by Christ as the representative of the human race terminated in the deliverance of man from the curse of the law through the great sacrifice. Demonic powers have no place in the scheme. But the author of this Epistle, after the manner of the writer of Hebrews, ² extends the efficacy of Christ's death to the overthrow of Satanic agencies. Through it God "blotted out the bond" of the law that was "against" men, "nailing it to the cross," and thus "triumphed" over the evil powers and made "a show of them openly," as if they held a "bond" against men, the dissolution of which by the death of Christ put them to rout by depriving them of their weapon, or as Hebrews puts the case, "destroyed him that hath the power of death, that is, the devil."

¹ πλήρωμα.

² Heb. ii. 14.

From these considerations and others which will be presented in the course of the exposition of the Epistle it is probable that Colossians is the work of a writer considerably later than Paul, a man in whom the Pauline thought had undergone marked modifications under the influences of the philosophy of the age, particularly that of Alexandria. It may seem like "begging the question" to argue against the Pauline authorship of Colossians on the ground that it contains ideas foreign or opposed to those of Paul, when the matter in dispute is whether or no those very ideas were his. But the argument is not altogether illegitimate, since the question is whether a given literary production is of such a character that we may suppose it to be the work of a man to whom certain writings are ascribed by the general consensus of scholars. It is not only proper and logical to compare a disputed writing with these, but it is the only means of deciding the question of its genuineness. The style is an important consideration in such a case, and that of this Epistle has traits which are both Pauline and unpauline. The same is true of the thought, not a little of which is entirely reconcilable with that of the apostle. These considerations have led some to suppose that the writing contains a genuine Pauline nucleus which was worked over and added to by the author of Ephesians or someone else. These matters are too abstruse to be discussed in a handbook intended for the general reader, and we must be content with the remark that portions of the Epistle appear to denote so wide a departure from the mode of thought and expression known to be Paul's from his undisputed Epistles, that they find their most natural explanation in the assumption of another author writing in and for another age. From this point of view the Epistle must have received its present form at the end of the first century or in the first half of the second.

THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

EXPOSITION.

The Epistle opens with a salutation in which the writer associates Timothy with himself as in 2 Corinthians and Philippians, following which is an expression of thanks to God for the faith of the brethren in Colossæ and of an earnest wish for their spiritual prosperity (i. 1-14).

Having heard of your faith in Christ Jesus (i. 4).—There is no indication in the Epistle of other than a second-hand knowledge of the persons and circumstances of the church in Colossæ on the part of the writer. This fact is not incompatible with the Pauline authorship, since there is no mention in Acts or in the generally accepted Epistles of Paul of a visit of the apostle in this city.

The hope laid up for you in the heavens (i. 5).—The Christian *hope* of the primitive Church was preëminently in the Messianic kingdom which was to be established at the second coming of Christ. Since he was expected from the heavens,¹ their hope was conceived to be there (iii. 3).²

In all the world (i. 6).—A manifest hyperbole (see verse 23; Rom. i. 8). *The grace of God* is a designation of the Christian gospel of which the readers are said to have had a true knowledge.

Epaphras (i. 7) was evidently a teacher of the church in

¹ 1 Thess. iv. 16.

² Rom. v. 2, viii. 18; Phil. iii. 20; 1 Pet. i. 4.

Colossæ, perhaps its founder (see iv. 12 and Philem. 23), and is called here a faithful minister of Christ on its behalf. The Greek word on which the translation "our" of the revised version is based is well attested, but is probably chargeable to an error of a copyist.

Knowledge of His will (i. 9), that is, what God requires in conduct (iv. 12).¹

Spiritual wisdom and understanding (i. 9).—The wisdom and understanding which the writer prays that his readers may possess are characterised as *spiritual*, a term which must be interpreted in accordance with the primitive-Christian idea of an immediate influence from the spirit of God, sometimes called the Spirit, or the Holy Spirit, to which certain religious experiences and phenomena were attributed.² Thus "spiritual wisdom" is opposed to "fleshly wisdom,"³ and is equivalent to "the wisdom that cometh down from above."⁴

Unto all pleasing (i. 10), that is, so as to be in all respects pleasing to Christ.

Strengthened with all power (i. 11).—The translation "with all power" is not good. "All power" is not meant, but "every [possible] power," ethically speaking. Noyes' rendering, "endued with all power" is still more objectionable. *Power* probably refers to the moral qualities of man in accordance with the Pauline usage,⁵ and "strengthened in, or by the quickening of, every moral power" probably expresses the writer's thought. That this strengthening is conceived as coming from God is evident from the words, *according to the might of His glory*, that is, the strength should correspond to the might of the glory of Him by whom it is imparted.

Inheritance of the saints in light (i. 12).—*In light* is to be

¹ Rom. ii. 18, xii. 2; Eph. v. 17, vi. 6.

² 1 Cor. ii. 13, xii. 8; Eph. i. 18.

³ 2 Cor. i. 12.

⁴ Jas. iii. 15.

⁵ 1 Cor. iv. 19; 1 Thess. i. 5.

connected with *inheritance*. *The inheritance in light* is the glorious kingdom which Christ was expected to establish at his second coming. The Messianic salvation is associated with "light" in contrast with the condition of sin, which is "darkness." When Christ should come in this kingdom he would bring the light in which he is represented as dwelling.¹

Accordingly, the declaration follows that God *delivered us out of the power of darkness, and translated us into the kingdom of the Son of His love* (i. 13).—Darkness is personified and conceived as possessing *power* with which it rules the "world" or the unbelievers.² *The kingdom* is the coming reign of Christ at his second appearance. This is the meaning of the kingdom of heaven, of God, and of Christ throughout the New Testament.³ The Messianic kingdom is in the future, but so certain and so near is it conceived to be that believers are regarded as already "translated" into it. *The Son of His love* is equivalent to "His beloved Son."⁴ The expression is not like Paul, and sounds harsh to one accustomed to his terminology. Harsh also and unlike the apostle's style is the construction of the long sentences comprising verses 3-8 and 9-18.

In whom we have our redemption, the forgiveness of our sins (i. 14).—*We*, the believers, are regarded as ransomed or set free from the penalty of sin *in* Christ, that is, by means of his atonement.⁵ The words, *the forgiveness of our sins*, are an explanation of the foregoing phrase in the sense that he who is forgiven is no longer subject to penalty. Paul nowhere in his undisputed Epistles uses the word here rendered *forgiveness*. On the other hand, the writer of Colossians avoids the Pauline term expressive of the apostle's

¹ 1 Tim. vi. 16; 1 John i. 7.

² Rom. xiii. 12; Eph. v. 8, vi. 12.

³ Matt. vi. 10; 1 Cor. iv. 20, xv. 24; Rom. xiv. 17.

⁴ Matt. iii. 17.

⁵ Rom. iii. 24, 25; Heb. ix. 15.

fundamental idea of justification by faith—two facts of no little importance for the question of authorship.

“Redemption” (ἀπολύτρωσις) has here the sense in which it is used by Paul, to whom is due the introduction of the conception into Christian theology. In Rom. iii. 24 the free “justification” of men by the grace of God is said to be “through the redemption in Christ Jesus,” that is, “deliverance effected through the death of Christ from the retributive wrath of a holy God and the merited penalty of sin” (Thayer’s Lexicon, *sub voce*). The same idea is expressed in Gal. iii. 13 by ἐξαγοράζω, to buy off, that is, by paying the penalty of sin by the death on the cross. In the undisputed Epistles Paul expresses this doctrine with precision, while in Colossians there is the vagueness of an imitator, and redemption (buying off) “from the curse of the law,” the imputation of righteousness, and justification by faith appear to lie outside the writer’s range of thought. Dr. T. K. Abbott’s remark that “forgiveness of sins” (ἀφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν) occurs twice in Paul’s speeches in Acts has no value for Paul’s use of the term, since these speeches are doubtless compositions of the writer of Acts.—“The Epistles to the Eph. and Col.” in the *International Critical Commentary*.

The mention of Christ as a Saviour leads the writer to an exposition of his doctrine of Jesus as a person, of his rank, functions, and relation to God, with especial reference to the false teachings current in the Colossian church (i. 15–29).

Who is the image of the invisible God (i. 15), literally, *of God the invisible*. Paul does not use the expression in his uncontested Epistles, and its occurrence here is favourable to the supposition that the Epistle was written by one who was familiar with the ideas and terms of the Alexandrian philosophy. The use of the present, “is,” requires the reference of the relation to God expressed by *image* to Christ’s existence at the time, that is, after his resurrection and exaltation. Whether his preëxistent state is included or no is not certain, but it is probable that it is. He is called “the image of God” in 2 Corinthians iv. 4 with the use of the present tense as here. The expression is less

emphatic than that in Hebrews (i. 3), and does not necessarily imply the ascription of a divine nature to Jesus. The same word is employed in iii. 10 of regenerated men in relation to God (see 1 Cor. xv. 49, where the word is used of the heavenly body which the risen Christians were expecting to have in the Messianic kingdom, according to Phil. iii. 21). Christ was not, however, as the *image of God the invisible*, regarded in the early Church as himself invisible, for he was expected at his second coming in an "appearance" and a "revelation," albeit with a "body of glory."¹

The firstborn of all creation (i. 15).—This is said in opposition to the Gnostic doctrine that Christ was not first in rank among the spirits. The translation of the revised version, which is also that of Noyes, does not accurately express the author's thought. He does not mean that Christ was a part of "creation," but that he was before everything that was created, and of course before every creature, angels included. Philo predicates the same relation of the Logos, and our author represents a conception of Christ well on the way to the doctrine of the fourth Gospel that "in the beginning was the word" (Logos). In calling Christ the *firstborn*, then, he distinguishes him from created beings, and thinks of him as not produced in time, but probably as having proceeded out of the Father before time was. So, according to Philo, the Father brought forth the Logos, or caused him to rise up.

For in him were all things created (i. 16).—*For* indicates a conclusion from the foregoing declaration that Christ was before every creature. *In him*² means not that he was merely the agent or instrument *through* whom the creation was effected, as in Hebrews i. 2 and 1 Cor. viii. 6, but "the conditioning ground upon which the creation rests." The expression does not mean that he was the *original* ground

¹ Phil. iii. 20, 21 ; 2 Thess. i. 7 ; 1 Pet. iv. 13 ; Tit. ii. 13.

² ἐν αὐτῷ.

of the creation, which could be thought by the author as no other than God, but that the work did not proceed without him, that through his activity in creation the divine idea of the world was carried out. The words "through him" at the end of the verse are another expression of this thought. The word here rendered "created" means in the New Testament "produced," "made," and not "ordered" or "arranged." The writer did not think of creation as the arrangement of preëxisting material into a cosmic order.

The things in the heavens (i. 16) must not be understood as excluding the heavens themselves.

All things (i. 16) are included, the *visible and the invisible*. The latter term denotes the angelic beings according to the Jewish mythology, which passed over into Christian belief. These are arranged in a hierarchy from the highest to the lowest, *thrones, dominions, principalities, powers*, or, perhaps, "thrones, principalities, powers, dominions." The terms are somewhat different in Ephesians i. 21. Lightfoot thinks that the writer shows impatience with this elaborate angelology, just as in ii. 18. But in neither place is there any clear indication of "impatience." He gives no sign either that the angelology is distasteful to him or that he does not accept it as a part of his belief. It is the *worship* of angels with which he is impatient. There is certainly no presumption in favour of his being in advance of his age respecting mythological conceptions.

Have been created (i. 16) denotes the result or completed act. *Unto him* (i. 16).—Christ is the end of all created things, which were made with reference to him, and without him could not realise that for which they were intended. This is said of God alone in Romans xi. 36, where the idea is unquestionably Pauline. There is at least a strong probability that the assignment of such a position to Christ denotes a development of the doctrine of his person beyond the soberer thought of Paul.

And in him all things consist (i. 17), that is, in him is the condition of the coherence and order of the universe. Compare "upholding all things by the word of his power."¹ In the doctrine of the person of Christ Hebrews and Colossians are so much in accord that they may be said to represent one phase of the development of primitive-Christian speculation on the subject. The doctrine that all things consist in Christ is purely speculative, and "goes beyond the scope of a merely religious reflection." Perhaps the idea of the immanence of Christ in the world is included here. Essentially equivalent is the saying in Eph. i. 23, "the fulness of him that filleth all in all." In the Hebrew prophets and in Paul this all-pervading glory and power are ascribed to God alone.² Not only is Christ so highly exalted in the two Epistles that the functions of God are frequently ascribed to him, but he is conceived as the centre and pivot of the entire creation. He is the Johannine Logos in the germ.

The prominence here given to Christ as the creator of all things and especially of the angels according to the different classes of them is conceded by Meyer, who maintains the Pauline authorship of the Epistle, to justify the supposition that the false teachers disparaged Christ in this respect, and that they at least had the elements of the Gnostic doctrine of the Demiurge which was later elaborated. There can be no doubt from the manner in which the matter is treated in the passages in question that the so-called false teachers in Colossæ denied that Christ was "before all things." That this heresy arose as early as the time of Paul is questionable. In any case the doctrine concerning Christ contained in the Epistle appears to have been called out by the speculative heresy which was current in the church in Colossæ, and it would probably never have been put forth without this provocation. Have we anything more here than one speculation set over against another? Certainly there is nothing in the teaching of Jesus concerning himself that could suggest the question whether or no he created the angels! But the appearance of the doctrine of

¹ Heb. i. 3.² Isa. vi. 3; Jer. xxiii. 24; 1 Cor. xv. 28.

the Epistle is easily explained historically. It only required the subordination of Christ and "the worship of angels" to incite someone to come to the defence of the imperilled faith with the teaching that Christ was "before all things," that he made the angels, and that in fact he held a cosmic position in the entire order of things.

And he is the head of the body, the Church (i. 18).—A special application of the teaching that Christ is "before all things." On the Church as his *body* see Rom. xii. 5, 1 Cor. x. 17, xii. 12-14; Eph. iv. 12, v. 23, 30. He was also the *beginning* [of the resurrection], *the firstborn from the dead*,¹ and there he was in order *that in all things he might have preëminence*, contrary to what the false teachers may say about his subordination.

*For it was the good pleasure of the Father that in him should all the fulness dwell*² (i. 19).—The writer here reaches the climax of his exaltation of Christ. The *fulness* is that of the divine nature (ii. 9). The term *pleroma*, "fulness," was employed by the Gnostics of the second century to denote the totality of the primal powers included in the divine being. The writer's introduction of it here and in ii. 9 without qualification implies that it was familiar to his readers in Colossæ, who must have heard it from their false teachers. These the writer wishes to refute, and he meets them on their own ground by employing their standard term and applying it to Christ, in order to show that he whom he had

¹ Yet would the writer have denied that others had been raised *ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν* before him?

² The translation, "It was the good pleasure of the Father," is open to question. "Father" is not in the Greek, and the only word expressed in the clause which can be the subject is *πλήρωμα*. The rendering, then, "All the fulness was pleased to dwell in him," that is, actually dwelt in him, is grammatically correct, and is supported by many exegetes. The word rendered "to dwell in" (*κατοικῆσαι*) may denote a permanent residence, and Lightfoot thinks that the false teachers maintained only a transient connection of the *πλήρωμα* with Jesus.

already declared to be in all respects preëminent was so also in this highest sense, that is, in having in himself the whole *pleroma*.

The doctrine of the two Epistles, Ephesians and Colossians, regarding Christ (Christology) has some Pauline features, such as the teaching that Jesus was the "image" of God.¹ "The firstborn of all creation"² can, however, hardly be classified with "the firstfruits of them that are asleep"³ and "the firstborn among many brethren."⁴ Col. i. 18, however, "the beginning, the firstborn from the dead," is of the same order as the Pauline expressions. The tendency of the Christology of the two Epistles is toward a metaphysical conception of Christ and the assignment to him of a cosmic position. He is farther removed from man than the Christ of Paul, "the second man," "the man from heaven," and "the second Adam." Paul went no farther than to represent Christ as the agent of the creation,⁵ and in Colossians we find the same idea (i. 16), but in this verse the writer declares Christ to be the *end* of the creation also.

And through him to reconcile all things unto Himself (i. 20).—The writer conceives it to be "the good pleasure" of God to reconcile to Himself through Christ *all things* absolutely, that is, *the things on earth and the things in the heavens*. *All things* are believed to be in a state of unreconciliation. Through the primal sin death had come into the world, and had passed upon all men in that all sinned.⁶ The whole "creation" was in "the bondage of corruption,"⁷ and was awaiting deliverance. The angels who had fallen were "kept in everlasting bonds under darkness unto the judgment of the great day."⁸ These primitive-Christian ideas must be assumed to have been in the mind of the writer. The reconciliation of "the things in the heavens" refers to the class of angelic beings as a whole, some of whom must have been thought to need reconciliation. In Romans viii.

¹ Col. i. 15; 1 Cor. xi. 7; 2 Cor. iv. 4.

⁶ Rom. v. 12.

² Col. i. 15.

⁴ Rom. viii. 29.

⁷ *Ibid.* viii. 19-21.

³ 1 Cor. xv. 20.

⁵ 1 Cor. viii. 6.

⁸ Jude 6.

38 "angels, principalities, and powers" are spoken of as if they might be capable of hostility to the cause of Christ; and in 1 Corinthians vi. 3 it is said that the Christians themselves will "judge angels." The reconciliation is in the future, and must have been conceived as about to be effected at the coming of Christ the second time in his kingdom. It is said to be the "good pleasure" of God to effect it, but the writer does not declare his conviction of its absolute accomplishment, and he does not enter into the question whether bad men and fallen angels would be reconciled to God regardless of their own choice. The unqualified reconciliation of "all things" to God at the second coming of Christ does not belong to the primitive-Christian thought. Christ was to reign until he had put all enemies under his feet.¹ He was to be revealed from heaven with the angels of his power in flaming fire rendering vengeance to them that know not God²; and in i. 23 of this Epistle the writer has hope that the believers will then be presented "without blemish and unreprouable" before him, only on the condition that they "continue in the faith." In Hebrews the condition of the apostate is regarded as hopeless.³

*Having made peace through the blood of his cross (i. 20).—*The blood of Christ is regarded as the propitiatory offering satisfying the demands of the law,⁴ but this writer omits the Pauline terms "through faith" and "justified by his blood."

Reconciled in the body of his flesh through death (i. 22), that is, God has reconciled them through the death of Christ. In the body of Christ through the instrumentality of his death was the atonement made by which their reconciliation became possible. The express mention of the *body* of Christ was doubtless made with reference to the false teachers who in connection with "the worship of angels" probably taught

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 24.

³ Heb. vi. 4-6, x. 26.

² 1 Thess. i. 8.

⁴ Rom. iii. 25, v. 9.

that these beings, who were supposed to be without bodies of flesh, had a part in the work of atonement. Thus Christ's atonement was disparaged.

Present you before him holy and unblamable and unreprouable (i. 22), that is, at the time of his second coming or Parousia. Their presentation before Christ, however, to share in the blessedness of the Messianic kingdom depended upon their steadfast adherence to the faith in which they had been instructed (i. 23).

The writer now proceeds to speak for himself as Paul, or for the apostle whom he personates, of his calling and sufferings as an apostle (i. 24-ii. 3).

To fill up on my part that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ (i. 24).—The idea is that he had a certain measure of affliction to bear as a follower and minister of Christ in behalf of the Church. Many of these sufferings of Christ, so-called, he had already borne,¹ and now he was filling up what was lacking in them in his own flesh through the bodily afflictions which he was enduring. He calls his own sufferings those of Christ in the sense that he is a "partaker" of them in being similarly afflicted.²

To fulfil the word of God, even the mystery which hath been hid from all ages and generations (i. 25, 26).—By the word of God is evidently meant the gospel of Christ, and the fulfilment of it is the accomplishment of its ministry.³ This is called a *mystery* probably because conceived as formerly hidden, but now manifested to the saints or believers.

To them God was pleased to make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the gentiles, which [riches] is Christ in you, the hope of glory (i. 27).—On the gospel as a *mystery* see 1 Cor. ii. 7, iv. 1; Rom. xvi. 25, 26.

Present every man perfect in Christ (i. 28), that is, at his

¹ 2 Cor. i. 5.

² 1 Pet. iv. 13; Phil. iii. 10.

³ Rom. xv. 19.

second coming (*v. 22*).¹ The perfection is designated as *in Christ* in the sense that it must be Christian.

For them at Laodicea and for as many as have not seen my face (ii. 1).—It is probable the false teachers were busy at Laodicea also, and that the writer was solicitous for that church as well as for the one in Colossæ on that account. The words, *and for as many*, include the Colossians and Laodiceans among those who had not seen the writer.

That they may know the mystery of God, even Christ (ii. 2).—The Greek text of this passage is doubtful and textual critics differ as to what is the correct reading. The revised version translates it as if *Christ* were in apposition with *mystery*. This is a proper rendering of Tischendorf's text (8th edition). The version of King James is from a text which reads "of God and of the Father and of Christ." Noyes following an earlier edition of Tischendorf omits "Christ." Lachmann's text reads, "the mystery of the God of Christ," and this reading is favoured by some scholars of note. That Christ himself should be called "the mystery of God" is contrary to the analogy of i. 26, 27, and the passages referred to in the note on that passage. The *mystery of God* is the gospel, as in the foregoing passages.

At this point the writer resumes the exposition of his doctrine of the person of Christ, and adds exhortations with especial reference to the false teachings (ii. 3-iii. 4).

In whom are all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge hidden (ii. 3).—Grammatically the rendering "in which," that is, the mystery, is admissible, and it is the only probable one if "Christ" be omitted in the preceding verse. If that word is retained, however, the reference of the pronoun is doubtful. The text is too obscure to warrant a positive conclusion. In any case the writer declares, in opposition to the false teachers who disparaged Christ, that in Christ or

¹ 1 Thess. ii. 19, 20; 2 Cor. xi. 2.

in his gospel, "the mystery of God," lay all the treasures of the wisdom and knowledge (Gnosis) of which they boasted.

With persuasiveness of speech (ii. 4).—This is said with reference to the specious reasonings of the false teachers, which were calculated to mislead. The Greek word thus rendered is not elsewhere used in the New Testament.¹

For though I be absent in the flesh, yet I am with you in the spirit (ii. 5).—It is open to question whether the Pauline terminology is here strictly to be interpreted in the Pauline sense. The apostle generally employs "Spirit" in the sense of the supernatural divine influence which is alone able to counteract the tendencies of the flesh, and which is the constant support and quickener of the believer's moral-religious life. From this point of view the writer's presence with the church in Colossæ *in the Spirit* was a presence in so far as this divine power, of which he was assumed to be a representative by preëminence, was effective in them.

Paul's doctrine of the Spirit is involved in no little obscurity. According to the analogy of his teaching in general he did not attribute to man a spirit as a part of his original natural endowment, but thought him to possess it only when he became a Christian believer, and as such received it as a supernatural gift. In other words, he did not regard it as a human faculty coördinate with "mind," "heart," and "conscience." When he speaks exactly he denies to the "natural man" ability to receive "the things of the Spirit of God," which are "spiritually discerned," while "he that is spiritual," that is, he who has as a believer been supernaturally endowed with the divine Spirit, "judgeth all things." From this it would appear that he regarded the spiritual in man as somewhat superadded to his natural endowment, somewhat essentially divine. It accords with this conception that he regarded the bodies of the believers who would be raised at the Parousia as "spiritual," like "the body of glory" assumed by the risen and ascended Jesus,² and taught that the resurrection pertained to those in whom dwelt "the Spirit of Him who raised

¹ *πιθανολογία*.

² Phil. iii. 21.

up Jesus from the dead.”¹ Some suppose that by “the spirit of man” Paul understood “a peculiar higher nature of the soul,” and not a separate substance alongside it,” some that he regarded it as “a mere organ of the natural human self-consciousness,” and others that he employed the word occasionally in accordance with the popular usage and without regard to his strictly doctrinal terminology in which the only concrete thing that belongs under the category of “Spirit” is the Spirit of God. Rom. viii. 16, 1 Cor. ii. 11, and 2 Cor. vii. 13 present exegetical difficulties to the interpretation herein mentioned. The supposition, however, is perhaps tenable that Paul sometimes spoke of the spirit of man when he intended to indicate no more than “the inner man” generally, while technically and doctrinally he recognised no other spiritual essence in man in the strict sense of the term than the divine Spirit which was a special endowment of the believer.

As, therefore, ye received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk in him (ii. 6).—This is an expression of the writer’s interest and solicitude with regard to the Colossians in view of the perils to which their faith was exposed by reason of the erroneous teachings that were current among them.

Walk in him, rooted and builded up in him (ii. 7).—The writer was not here attentive to the relation to each other of the figures employed.

Through his philosophy and vain deceit (ii. 8).—There is nothing in the original corresponding to *his*, and the word is superfluous. The term *philosophy* may mean any philosophy, but here doubtless refers to the speculations of the false teachers, who probably arrogated the word to themselves as a designation of their doctrines. It is not used elsewhere in the New Testament. *Vain deceit* is another term for the sort of philosophy which in the writer’s judgment was employed by the teachers in question.

After the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ (ii. 8).—The first expression denotes the purely human character of the “philosophy” in question in

¹ Rom. viii. 11.

² ψυχῇ.

contrast with the "wisdom not of this world,"¹ and the second the rudiments of the religious teachings of men not Christians.² In the connection of the third there is a want of precision, since *not after Christ* cannot well be joined either with *make spoil of* or with *vain deceit*.³

For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily (ii. 9).—Hence the readers should not be made spoil of by a philosophy which is opposed to the truth that is in him, that is, in his gospel. The word rendered "Godhead" does not mean "divine qualities or attributes," but "the divine nature." The expression is made as emphatic as possible. It is not simply the fulness (*pleroma*) as in i. 19, but the *entire pleroma of the divinity*. *Dwelleth* (ii. 9), "is present," "exists," is in the present tense, and refers not to Jesus in his earthly existence, but to the glorified Christ who according to Hebrews "sat down on the right hand of God." This indwelling of the divine essence in Christ is conceived to be *bodily*, that is, so that it has a bodily manifestation, is clothed upon with a bodily form. This idea comports with the conception of "spiritual bodies" which the risen saints were expected to have at the second coming of Christ.⁴ These "celestial bodies,"⁵ it was supposed, would resemble Christ's "body of glory,"⁶ the "bodily" manifestation of the divine

¹ 1 Cor. ii. 6.

² Gal. iv. 3.

³ The words rendered "the rudiments of the world" (*τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου*) are susceptible of a different rendering from that given in the text. They perhaps refer to the "personal elemental spirits," to which in the later Judaism certain ruling and guiding functions were assigned over the stars, the seasons, the months, etc. According to the Book of Jubilees there were created by God on the first day the angels of the clouds, of cold, of heat, of hail, of thunder, etc. See "angel of the waters," Rev. xvi. 5 and Enoch lxxxii. 10 f. This interpretation is very suitable to the passage under consideration, since *κατὰ τὰ στ.* is placed over against *κατὰ χριστόν*. See v. Soden in *Handkommentar* on the passage, and T. K. Abbott, p. 248.

⁴ 1 Cor. xv. 44.

⁵ *Ibid.* xv. 40.

⁶ Phil. iii., 21.

pleroma. It is impossible not to notice the harshness and abruptness with which this declaration of the writer's extreme doctrine of the person of Christ is introduced in the connection of the passage. If it is a part of the original Epistle, it can indicate only that the writer made great haste to introduce his exalted and high-wrought Christology.

And in him ye are made full (ii. 10).—In fellowship with Christ the believer is regarded as having those spiritual charisms or “gifts”¹ which were attributed to the divine Spirit.

Who is the head of all principality and power (ii. 10).—He is declared to be superior to the angelic beings of whom he is said in i. 16 to have been the creator. The motive here is the same as in the former passage, that is, to show the Colossians the folly of the “worship of angels” and the subordination of Christ taught them by the heretics.

In whom ye were also circumcised with a circumcision not made with hands (ii. 11).—This refers to the conversion of the believers which was *in* Christ causally, and was figuratively a *putting off of the body of the flesh* regarded as the seat of sin,² so that they are conceived as no longer “fleshly” or “carnal,” “sold under sin.”³

*In the circumcision of Christ (ii. 11).*⁴—This is the circumcision which, figuratively speaking, is effected in them by means of Christ, that is, by their relation to him as believers.

The putting off of “the body of the sins of the flesh” in verse 11 calls to mind Paul's “body of sin,”⁵ mortifying “the deeds of the body” (Rom. viii. 13). “The body of the sins of the flesh” is not, however, a

¹ 1 Cor. xii. 4.

² Rom. vii. 23, 25; Gal. v. 16; Eph. ii. 3.

³ Rom. vii. 24.

⁴ A περιτομή ἀχειροποιήτος and a περιτομή τοῦ χριστοῦ are unknown to Paul's undisputed Epistles. The apostle recognises an inward circumcision, but not in such terms as these. Rom. ii. 28, 29; Phil. iii. 3.

⁵ Rom. vi. 6.

Pauline expression, and it is doubtful whether the apostle could have written it. It betrays the hand of an inexperienced imitator who made the awkward combination from Paul's "body of sin" and "flesh." But if Paul does not say "sins of the flesh," he regarded the flesh as the seat of sin. With it he says we "serve the law of sin."¹ Its "mind" is "enmity against God," and is "death."² Since it was conceived as the substance composing the material body, the latter term is sometimes employed as synonymous with it, as is also "members," so that "deeds of the body" is equivalent to sinful actions which are prompted by the flesh, and the "law in the members" is the law of the flesh. Technically, however, the body is to Paul the *form* of human existence, whether it be now filled with the flesh as a material organism, or again with the "glory" or light-substance of the resurrection state as a "spiritual body."³ That by "flesh" Paul meant literally flesh, the substance of the material bodily organism, is evident from his identification of it with "the body" and the "members," and this physical substratum is never lost sight of when he mentions some "works of the flesh" which are not of immediate derivation from this organism. He never has in mind any such vague idea as "the weak and creaturely side of our nature"—a definition of "the flesh" which itself needs defining. The Pauline doctrine of man (anthropology) is dominated by the contrast of "flesh" and "Spirit." The former "lusts against" the latter,⁴ which is the supernatural divine principle bestowed upon the believer. The flesh is by its very nature "corruptible," and is doomed to perish.⁵ The body, conceived as the material organism, is compared to a "tabernacle" which is laid aside at death (2 Cor. v. 1), yet "the body that shall be,"⁶ the "spiritual body," the "celestial body,"⁷ is given of God in the resurrection. Paul conceived man as capable of existence without "flesh," but not without a "body." The *ψυχή*, soul or life-principle of the flesh, is conceived by him as inseparably connected with it and as sharing its fortune in so far as it is perishable. The "incorruption" that is "put on" is regarded as attainable only by means of the indwelling of the divine Spirit, which is the sole "earnest" of the resurrection at the Parousia, of the swallowing up of mortality by life.⁸ "Perishing" and "destruction" are the doom of all who have

¹ Rom. vii. 25.

² *Ibid.* viii. 6, 7.

³ 1 Cor. xv. 44; Phil. iii. 12.

⁴ Gal. v. 17.

⁵ 1 Cor. xv. 36, 42, 53, 54.

⁶ *Ibid.* xv. 37.

⁷ *Ibid.* xv. 40.

⁸ Rom. viii. 11; 2 Cor. v. 5.

not this Spirit.¹ The resurrection of unbelievers to "incorruption" and their subsequent punishment is not compatible with Paul's anthropology and his doctrine of the last things (eschatology).

Having been buried with him in baptism, etc. (ii. 12).—In baptism the believer is supposed to die to sin and be *raised* to "newness of life."² This is the circumcision "not made with hands." In this conception of a mystic spiritual union with Christ is expressed more of the spirit and sentiment of genuine Paulinism than in the whole of the Epistle to the Hebrews with which this letter is in many respects very closely related.

Through faith in the working of God (ii. 12).—The belief that God raised Christ from the dead is regarded as the indispensable condition of the believer's being brought into that spiritual union with Jesus by which he is able to walk with him "in newness of life." Only for him who believes this can the atonement of Christ be efficacious.³ They alone who have this faith have the assurance that they will be "raised up" and "presented" before him when he shall come again in the glory of his kingdom.⁴

And you being dead through your trespasses and the uncircumcision of your flesh (ii. 13).—As sinners, uncircumcised gentiles, the Colossians are represented as having been subject to death, not merely the physical death which came upon all men through Adam's sin,⁵ but also the eternal death which was, in the Pauline thought, the exclusion from the resurrection at the second coming of Christ and from participation in the blessedness of the Messianic kingdom.⁶

¹ 1 Cor. i. 8; 2 Cor. ii. 15; 1 Thess. v. 3.

³ Rom. iv. 24, vi. 8, 9.

² Rom. vi. 4.

⁴ 2 Cor. iv. 13.

⁵ Rom. v. 12.

⁶ It is difficult to think of Paul as using the expression "dead in the uncircumcision of your flesh" (*νεκρὸς τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν*). He certainly could not have said of gentiles that they were "dead" *because* uncircumcised. Such a conception would be unthinkable from his point of view. If not unthinkable, it is at least

Did He also quicken together with him (ii. 13).—The thought of this passage is not simply that of an ethical raising up of the believers, but there is included in it the conception of their actual resurrection at the Parousia and their participation in “the inheritance of the saints in light,” their “translation into the kingdom of the Son” (i. 12, 13). The expression may well be interpreted in accordance with the Pauline doctrine that “if the Spirit of Him who raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He who raised up Christ Jesus from the dead will also quicken your mortal bodies.”¹ The idea of the possession of the life in Christ and that of its fruition in “the age to come” were so closely connected in the primitive-Christian thought that the former readily passed over into the latter even without the use of the future tense (i. 13; Eph. ii. 5).

Having forgiven us all our trespasses (ii. 13).—This implies the acceptance on the part of God of those who through faith have appropriated the atonement made by Christ in his death.

Having blotted out the bond written in ordinances which was against us (ii. 14), that is, the handwriting or manuscript that was conceived to exist in the Mosaic law, and that was regarded as *against* men because it threatened them with penalties. They themselves could not “blot it out” except by an entire obedience, which was impossible. Neither could God do it, unless the penalty were paid. This was done on the cross, and accordingly He “took it out of the way, nailing it to the cross.” The law which condemned men is assumed to have lost its penal validity when Christ

highly improbable that he would have employed these words as a “symbol of alienation from God.” How could uncircumcision symbolise a sinful condition to him who declares that neither circumcision nor uncircumcision is anything? The words appear to have been written by an unskilful imitator who had for the moment forgotten his rôle.

¹ Rom. viii. 11.

by his death "redeemed" (bought off) men from the "curse" of it.¹ The doctrine is Pauline both in this Epistle and in Hebrews, but in neither has it the distinctive Pauline expression.

Having put off from Himself the principalities and the powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them (ii. 15).—The *principalities and the powers* are the demonic spirits, "the world-rulers of this darkness."² Although the same words are employed that are used to designate the good angels in verse 10, they here refer to the devilish angelic hierarchy, "the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places," as they are called in the passage in Ephesians. By reason of the "bond" against men they are conceived to have a certain power over the human race which they would employ for their diabolical purposes of destruction. Of this power the sacrifice on the cross is regarded as depriving them, since it "blotted out" the "bond," and in the cross God "put them off from Himself," or "disarmed" them (for this the word also means), and "made a show of them openly, triumphing over them."³ It is instructive to note how this extravagant delineation of the results of the atonement of Christ, adopted to refute the false teachers, floats in the region of mythological conceptions. In the nature of the case the contest with the false teachers could only be one in which one mythology was pitted against another.

Which are a shadow of the things to come (ii. 17).—The readers are counselled not to permit anyone to judge them in respect to ritual observances, since these are only a shadow cast back by the things that are to come, that is, by the Messianic kingdom of the future age. "Feasts," "new moons," and "sabbath-days" are only sensuous, transient

¹ Gal. iii., 13, iv. 5; Heb. ix. 12.

² Eph. vi. 12.

³ The triumph of the Messiah over Satan was dramatically represented in the Jewish theology. See Weber, *Jüd. Theol.*, p. 398.

types of the divine reality of the Parousia, which is their antitype, since it is the true and perfect theocracy that already ideally exists in the heavens, and which will come in glory with the returning Christ. In this thought the writer is quite in accord with the author of Hebrews.¹

Of these *things to come the body is Christ's* (ii. 17), that is, his is the substance of the Messianic kingdom of which ritual observances are only a shadow. This is another way of saying that he is the head and ruler of the coming kingdom. The false teachers, who insist upon regarding the shadow, miss the substance.

Let no man rob you of your prize by a voluntary humility and a worshipping of the angels (ii. 18).—The prize in the contest, that is, the blessedness of the Messianic kingdom, ought to be won by the Colossian Christians themselves, and they are warned to let no man rob them of it through misleading them by false teachings.

By a voluntary humility (ii. 18) is a doubtful translation. Better is the rendering, *wishing to do it by humility*, etc., that is, by a false humility which the false teachers assumed. It may have been connected with the "*worship of angels*" in the sense that God was too exalted an object of worship for men. We have the testimony of Irenæus and Epiphanius to the worship of angels by Gnostics, and Theodoret speaks of the practice as existing in Phrygia. The actual worship of angels as objects of adoration is undoubtedly meant, and not a worship of God similar to that rendered by angels. Yet this latter interpretation has strangely had advocates.

Dwelling in the things which he hath seen (ii. 18).—Some authorities read "not seen." But if the "not" be omitted the sense is undoubtedly "things seen or professed to be seen in visions" with reference to the angel-world, so that the translation of King James' version and of Noyes,

¹ Heb. viii. 5, x. 1.

“intruding into those things which he hath not seen,” gives the writer’s meaning.

Puffed up by his fleshly mind (ii. 18), that is, the mind under the dominion of the tendencies of a man who is of the “world,” and hence unspiritual, or from the point of view of the writer, unchristian,¹ “the mind of the flesh is enmity against God.”

The psychology of the Epistle is essentially Pauline. Paul employs *νοῦς* to designate that endowment of “the inward man” which corresponds to our “mind” or “the theoretical and practical reason.”² In Rom. vii. 23 it is synonymous with “inward man” in verse 22, and denotes a disposition to obey the divine law in opposition to the tendencies of fleshly desire. In this sense “the law of the mind” is set over against “the law of sin” (vii. 23, 25). It designates “the inward man” in its susceptibility to the Divine Spirit, of which it is the human counterpart. Rom. vii. appears to teach the inability of the “mind” successfully to oppose the “flesh,” since the result of the conflict of the two powers is that the man is “brought into captivity to the law of sin” in his “members,” and the doctrine that righteousness or salvation cannot be attained without the intervention of the divine Spirit is according to the analogy of the general teaching of the apostle. “They that are in the flesh cannot please God,” but the Christian believers “are not in the flesh,” if “the Spirit of God dwell in” them.³ Yet it is one of the paradoxes of his teaching that in Rom. i. and ii. he declares that men are able by means of their understanding to know God by “the things that are made,” and without the law to “do by nature the things contained in the law.” With all the mind’s susceptibility to moral influences it is represented on the other hand as capable of such weakness and perversion as to justify the epithet “reprobate.”⁴ It may become to such a degree subject to the animal impulses as to deserve to be called “the mind of the flesh,”⁵ and “the fleshly mind” as in the verse under consideration. There are also “blinded minds”⁶ and minds that are “corrupted.”⁷ The moral function assigned to the mind is again recognised in the idea that it is capable of a “renewing.”⁸ It is doubtless in this condition of renewal that it is “the mind of Christ,”⁹

¹ Rom. viii. 7.

⁴ *Ibid.* i. 28.

⁷ *Ibid.* xi. 3.

² 1 Cor. xiv. 14.

⁵ *Ibid.* viii. 7.

⁸ Rom. xii. 2.

³ Rom. viii. 8, 9.

⁶ 2 Cor. iii. 14, iv. 4.

⁹ 1 Cor. ii. 16.

that is, a mind in which the divine Spirit abides. The activity of volition so graphically delineated in Rom. vii. was doubtless conceived as a function of the "mind": "For the will is present with me, but how to perform that which is good I find not" (verse 18). The condition described by the term "fleshly mind" is that of "death," by which Paul designates not only physical dissolution, but also the state called "everlasting destruction,"¹ or death without hope of the resurrection, "perishing." To this result the preponderance of the flesh must, he conceives, inevitably lead. The law is ineffectual for deliverance from this condition. The divine Spirit can alone accomplish salvation under the dispensation of "grace" through the redemption of Christ appropriated by "faith."

And not holding fast the Head (ii. 19).—On account of their "worship of the angels" they disregard and subordinate the Head, Christ. In the next clause the figure, begun in the preceding, is carried out, and the rendering should be, *from which [the head] all the body, etc., increaseth with the increase of God*, that is, *the increase* effected by God. The figure is of the Church in relation to its Head, Christ.

If ye died with Christ from the rudiments of the world (ii. 20).—In becoming Christians the believers are regarded as having entered into the mystic fellowship of the death of Christ, that is, as having died with him to all the claims of ritual, ordinances, etc., abolished by him in his death, which are *rudiments of the world*. They ought not then to act *as though living in the world*, or in the non-Christian realm of life, and to subject themselves to those things.

Handle not, nor taste, nor touch (all which things are to perish with the using) after the precepts and doctrines of men (ii. 21, 22).—These are some of the "ordinances" referred to in the preceding verse. They probably all relate to foods and drinks, though some interpret the first and others the last according to 1 Corinthians vii. 1. The meaning of the parenthetical clause is doubtful. Some render it, "all which things tend to destruction (ethical) when abused." The

¹ 2 Thess. i. 9.

word translated *with the using* means also "with the abusing" in some connections, and since the word rendered *perish* means sometimes "moral destruction," "the loss of salvation," the connection itself is ambiguous. The correct rendering probably is, *all which things tend to perish*¹ *with the consumption, or using up*.

Which things have, indeed, a show of wisdom (ii. 23), that is, "an unmerited reputation" of wisdom, in *will-worship*, or by means of a worship arbitrarily chosen and hence not commanded by God, probably angel-worship. The writer appears to have coined the word rather inaccurately rendered *will-worship*.² It is not found in Greek writers.

Not of any value against the indulgence of the flesh (ii. 23).—The rendering, "not in any honour with respect to the satisfaction of the flesh," or "for satisfying the flesh," is probably closer to the original, and proceeds upon the judgment that the false teachers arrogated to themselves "honour" for their false "humility" and "severity to the body," and found in this "unmerited reputation of wisdom" a satisfaction of their fleshly nature, pride, and the puffing up of their carnal mind (verse 19). The writer, however, declares that these ascetic practices and the accompanying disposition are *not in any honour* with regard to the self-indulgence of their lower nature which they derive from them.

If, then, ye were raised together with Christ, seek the things that are above (iii. 1).—*Then* refers to ii. 20, and *if* implies not doubt but certainty. *The things that are above* designate the Messianic salvation which is regarded as in the heavens with *Christ on the right hand of God*, whence it will "descend" with him at his second coming.

For ye died, and your life is hid with Christ in God (iii. 3).—This is the Pauline doctrine of the ethical death of believers in Christ. Such is the mystical fellowship of believers with

¹ Matt. xv. 17.

² ἐθελοθηρησκέια.

him that in his death to sin they die with him. "If one died for all, then all died."¹ The "old man is crucified with him." The believer is baptised in the death of Christ.² The sequence is a new life whose consummation will be effected at the Parousia.

When Christ, who is our life, shall be manifested, then will you be manifested with him in glory (iii. 4).—This is the Pauline reigning with Christ and being glorified with him in the kingdom of God soon to come—the "glory about to be revealed" in the believers.

The Epistle now proceeds with exhortations grounded on moral principles deduced from the foregoing section (ii. 4-iii. 4) and adapted to individual culture and to the relations of the believers to one another (iii. 5-iv. 6).

Mortify, therefore, your members which are upon the earth (iii. 5), that is, "slay," render ineffective for sin your bodily passions and appetites, "the body of the flesh" (ii. 11). Compare Paul's "mortify the deeds of the body"³ and "If thy hand or thy foot causeth thee to stumble cut it off."⁴ *Covetousness which is idolatry,* that is, the worship of Mammon.⁵

For which things' sake cometh the wrath of God upon the sons of disobedience (iii. 6).—The reference is to the judgment at the second coming of Christ in correlation with verse 4. Compare "the wrath to come,"⁶ "wrath in the day of wrath,"⁷ and "the wrath of the Lamb," "the great day of their wrath," that is, that of God and the Lamb.⁸ *The sons of disobedience* are those who reject the gospel of Christ.⁹

In the which ye also walked aforetime, when ye lived in these things (iii. 7).—The sense is somewhat doubtful since "among whom," that is, *the sons of disobedience*, is a gram-

¹ 2 Cor. v. 14.

² Rom. vi. 4, 6.

³ *Ibid.* viii. 13.

⁴ Matt. xviii. 8, 9.

⁵ *Ibid.* vi. 24.

⁶ 1 Thess. i. 10.

⁷ Rom. ii. 5.

⁸ Rev. vi. 17.

⁹ Eph. v. 6.

matical rendering which perhaps should have the preference, provided, of course, *the sons of disobedience* (verse 6) be retained. Tischendorf omits the words notwithstanding the strong testimony in their favour and the incompleteness of the thought without them.

Railing (iii. 8).—The word so rendered ¹ is used of blasphemy against God. “ Evil-speaking ” is perhaps a better translation, in which case the following words should be rendered “ filthy language out of your mouth ” (Noyes).

The old man *the new man* (iii. 9).—The former designates the pre-Christian mode of life according to the Pauline figure of the first Adam, the author of sin, and the latter the Christian disposition and life, or Christ, “ the last Adam,” the author of salvation.²

Which is being renewed unto knowledge after the image of Him that created him (iii. 10).—This *new man* is not at once complete, but is in a condition of development³ toward a *knowledge after the image* of God, a further and fuller acquaintance with spiritual truths and the principles of a religious life, from which the vices mentioned in verses 8 and 9 are excluded.

Where there cannot be Greek and Jew (iii. 11).—The local adverb *where* indicates haste in writing, and is awkward. “ In which condition,” that is, that of having put on “ the new man,” is the meaning. External conditions and relations, which separate men according to race and station, disappear because disregarded in the life which has put on the new man, Christ, who, “ in all his believers the all-determining principle of the new life and activity, forms the higher unity in which those old separations and oppositions become without significance and as no longer existing.”

Put on, therefore, as God's elect (iii. 12).—*Elect* is the Old Testament designation of the people of God. Here it means

¹ βλασφημία.

² Rom. vi. 6 ; 1 Cor. xv. 49 ; Eph. iv. 22.

³ 2 Cor. iv. 16.

those who have accepted the gospel of Christ, and are accordingly chosen out of the multitude of unbelievers to be partakers of the Messianic salvation in the coming kingdom (Rom. viii. 33; Eph. i. 4).

Even as the Lord forgave you, so also do ye (iii. 13).—Some authorities read "Christ" instead of "Lord," but the meaning is the same in both cases. The mutual forgiveness of sins among men is a Christian requirement, though not unknown to the Old Testament.¹ The divine forgiveness is made conditional on the subject's forgiveness of offences committed against him in Mark xi. 25, and this condition is implied in the Lord's prayer. The forgiveness of sins by Christ can hardly be called a doctrine of the apostolic age. In Mark ii. 5 and parallels Jesus is represented as saying that the Son of Man had power *on earth* to forgive sins. The tendency to magnify the person of Jesus and to assign him a cosmic position, which is manifest in this Epistle and its related ones, Hebrews and Ephesians, would naturally lead to attributing this prerogative to him in his exalted state "on the right hand of God." The doctrine is unknown in the great Pauline Epistles. This single instance is accordingly instructive. On the contrary in ii. 13 it is God who forgives, and in Ephesians iv. 32 He grants forgiveness "in Christ."

To the which also ye were called in one body (iii. 15), that is, in the community of Christian believers, in which Christ is "all things and in all" (verse 11). The conception is Pauline.²

Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom (iii. 16).—Paul says "the word of the Lord"³ and regarded Christ as speaking through him.⁴ But the current expression is "the word of God." The exaltation of the person

¹ See Matt. xviii. 22; Luke xvii. 3, where repentance is made a condition.

² Rom. xii. 5; 1 Cor. x. 17, xii. 12, 13.

³ 1 Thess. i. 8, iv. 15.

⁴ 2 Cor. xiii. 3.

of Christ which characterises this Epistle, and which was, as we have seen, called forth by the situation in Colossæ, doubtless led to the employment of the official term, "Christ," instead of "Lord."

Teaching and admonishing one another with psalms and hymns and spiritual songs (iii. 16).—These terms occur in the New Testament only in Colossians and Ephesians. They are essentially synonymous, and the slight shades of difference among them are not easily definable. Their use here in connection with *teaching and admonishing* suggests the phenomena of "speaking with tongues" ¹ which appears to have been an ecstatic, indistinct expression of emotions, needing "interpretation." In the strained and high-strung spiritual conditions which existed in the early Church it is probable that *teaching and admonition* sometimes took a form that is well expressed by the terms in question. The expression *spiritual songs*, which means "songs given by the Spirit," accords with this interpretation, the "Holy Spirit" being regarded in the primitive Church as the source of the "gifts" of "tongues," "prophecy," etc.

Singing with grace in your hearts unto God (iii. 16), that is, as Christians who are such by the *grace* of God, and who enjoy the indwelling of the gospel of *grace*. "In thankfulness," is a proper and perhaps a preferable rendering.

Do all in the name of the Lord Jesus (iii. 17).—*Name* stands for all that Jesus represented to the Christians, and the practical injunction to the readers is to let all their conduct be in the mind and spirit of Christ. Compare, "the mind of Christ." ²

Giving thanks to God the Father through him (iii. 17).—*The Father* is regarded as the source of all that for which the believers as such should be thankful; but since Jesus by his atonement is regarded as the mediator through whom the Christian salvation came, and through whom its Messianic

¹ 1 Cor. xiv. 15, 26.

² *Ibid.* ii. 16; Phil. ii. 5.

consummation will be effected in the future "age," it is *through him*, that is, through his benefaction to them, that they should be thankful.

Wives, be in subjection to your husbands, as is fitting in the Lord (iii. 18).—*Subjection* means not only subordination but also "submission" and "obedience." This teaching is in accordance with the ideas of the time relative to the relation of husband and wife. Compare Paul's doctrines and injunctions on the subject: "The head of the woman is the man,"¹ and "let them [women] be in subjection."²

As is fitting in the Lord (iii. 18), that is, as is becoming in those who are Christians.

Servants, obey in all things them that are your masters according to the flesh (iii. 22).—*Servants* here means "bond-servants" or "slaves." In the Old Testament slavery was not only recognised, but regulations were made in order to control it. Jesus said nothing directly against it, although the practical result of his teachings must be to do away with it. It is incompatible with his doctrine of the Fatherhood of God and with the principle of the so-called Golden Rule.³ Paul is also silent on the subject of the injustice and evil of slavery, and in addition to this surprising negative attitude goes so far as positively to affirm that it is indifferent to a Christian whether he be a free man or a slave, and to advise the bond-servant who can become free to prefer his bondage.⁴ "In Christ" there can be neither bond nor free.⁵ But to Paul these external conditions were of slight importance in view of the impending end of the world. It was hardly worth while to disturb a social order which was soon to be dissolved, and run all the risks of disorder and conflict which would result from an anti-slavery propaganda. The author of Colossians, then, writes in entire accord with the Pauline doctrine both in reference to slaves and women.

¹ I Cor. xi. 3.

² *Ibid.* xiv. 34 ff.

³ Matt. vii. 12.

⁴ I Cor. vii. 21.

⁵ Gal. iii. 28.

This is one of many historical examples of the predominance of the Time-Spirit over the Christ-Spirit.

Knowing that from the Lord ye shall receive the recompense of the inheritance (iii. 24).—In the Messianic kingdom the slave who has been faithful to his master will be recompensed at the hand of Christ himself. Let him endure his bondage for a little while. “The day is at hand”; and in the blessed “age to come” he will be on an equality with him who in “the present age” is lording it over him, for “in Christ” there is neither bond nor free.

For ye serve the Lord Christ (iii. 24).—The Christian slave is really a servant of Christ, though outwardly serving man.

For he that doeth wrong shall receive again for the wrong that he hath done (iii. 25).—The slave is expected to make an application of this commonplace to the effect that the master who treats him unjustly will receive a merited punishment, since *there is no respect of persons* in the divine judgment. Finally, the masters are admonished, since they also *have a Master in heaven*, to render to their slaves *what is just and equal (iv. 1)*, that is, to treat them in accordance with the principle of Christian brotherhood which places all men, bond and free, upon a footing of equality. The idea that setting them free might be implied in this treatment is not expressed.

Continue stedfastly in prayer (iv. 2).—See Rom. i. 9, xii. 12; 1 Thess. v. 17, “pray without ceasing.” Compare Luke xviii. 1.

Watching therein, that is, being spiritual, attentive, and alert (iv. 2). See Matt. xxvi. 41; Eph. vi. 18; 1 Thess. v. 6; 1 Pet. iv. 7, v. 7.

Withal praying for us also, that God may open unto us a door (iv. 3), that is, may furnish an opportunity for the ministration of the gospel,¹ *the mystery of Christ*.

For which I am also in bonds (iv. 3).—The writer declares

¹ 1 Cor. xvi. 9; 2 Cor. ii. 12.

that on account of the mystery of Christ or the gospel, he is in bonds *also*, that is, in addition to other afflictions which he had suffered in the same cause. On the supposition of the spuriousness of the Epistle this belongs to the fiction of authorship.

Walk in wisdom toward them that are without, redeeming the time (iv. 5).—In respect to those who do not belong to the Christian community the readers are exhorted to employ not simply shrewdness, but also the wise and upright and kindly dealing which springs from the Christian disposition.¹

Redeeming the time (iv. 5), that is, so using the time as to employ the right moment for the actions in which the *wisdom* in dealing with those who are not believers consists.

Let your speech be always with grace seasoned with salt (iv. 6).—Speech to “those without” should be with pleasantness, agreeableness, yet not without the seasoning of vigour, point, and manliness. It should not be insipid and flat.²

The Epistle concludes with personal references, greetings, etc. (iv. 7-18).

All my affairs shall Tychicus make known to you, the beloved brother (iv. 7).—A Tychicus is mentioned in Acts xx. 4 as a companion of Paul's on one of his missionary journeys and also in 2 Timothy iv. 12, and Titus iii. 12.

Together with Onesimus (iv. 9), the slave of Philemon (Philem. 10).

Aristarchus (iv. 10).—See Acts xix. 29, xx. 4, xxvii. 2; Philem. 24. *Mark*. See Acts xii. 12, 25, xiii. 5, 13, xv. 37; 2 Tim. iv. 11.

And Jesus who is called Justus (iv. 11).—Nothing is known of this man, who is probably not the one mentioned in Acts xviii. 7.

Epaphras, who is one of you (iv. 12).—See i. 7 and Philem. 23. According to i. 7 he had been a teacher of the Colos-

¹ Phil. ii. 14; 1 Thess. v. 17; 1 Cor. v. 12.

² Mark ix. 49, 50

sians, and he is here represented as *striving* for them *in his prayers*, probably on account of the perils to which their faith was exposed by the presence of the false teachers.

Luke, the beloved physician, and Demas (iv. 14).—See 2 Tim. iv. 10, 11; Philem. 24. We can only conjecture why Luke should have been distinguished with this professional epithet, while Demas is simply mentioned by name.

Nymphas (iv. 15) is mentioned as one in whose house some of the Christians in Colossæ were accustomed to assemble. *Their* probably includes Nymphas and his household.

And when this Epistle hath been read among you (iv. 16).—*That from Laodicea* can only mean one sent by the writer of Colossians to the church at Laodicea. An exchange of Epistles is thus enjoined, whether because similar needs in the two places rendered such a proceeding desirable or not, is uncertain. Nothing is known of this Epistle.

And say to Archippus (iv. 17).—What the *ministry* of Archippus was is uncertain. In the absence of Epaphras he may have had an oversight of the interests of the church, but why he should have been thought to need the particular admonition conveyed in the words here employed can only be conjectured.

Remember my bonds (iv. 18).—This sententious expression, whose touching pathos, coming from the heart, speaks to the heart, may be regarded as an appeal of the writer for the prayers of his brethren in Colossæ (verse 3), or as a delicate intimation that in view of his afflictions they should not fail to give due heed to the teachings contained in the Epistle, so as not to add to his sorrows by listening to those who were leading them away from the true faith.

THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

INTRODUCTION.

EPHESUS, a city of Ionia in Asia Minor, was visited by Paul on his second missionary journey with Aquila and Priscilla. Here he “reasoned with the Jews” in the synagogue, but remained only a short time. Hither came Apollos, “mighty in the Scriptures,” and, knowing only the baptism of John, was instructed “more carefully” in “the way of God,” by these companions of the apostle whom he had left there.¹ Paul afterwards visited the city again and remained there two years and three months teaching in the synagogue and in the school of Tyrannus. Considerable success appears to have attended his labours here and “the word of the Lord grew mightily and prevailed.”²

The Epistle naturally falls into two principal parts—a doctrinal (i.–iii.) and a practical (iv.–vi.). After the salutation the writer proceeds to express gratitude to God for the “spiritual blessings” of the believers, especially blessed in that they have been chosen “before the foundation of the world” to “adoption as sons,” and have redemption and forgiveness through the blood of Christ, in whom it was the purpose of God to “sum up all the things in the heavens and upon the earth” (i. 1–14). Special thanks being given for the faith of the Ephesians, the writer takes the occasion

¹ Acts xviii. 19–21.

² *Ibid.* xix. 20.

furnished by the incidental introduction of the name of Christ to express his conception of the preëminent rank and glory which belong to him in his exaltation "above all rule and authority" (i. 18-23). The gentile readers are congratulated on having been brought out of their former mode of life which was "according to the prince of the power of the air," and "raised up" with Christ, so that they are "no more strangers and sojourners," but "fellow-citizens with the saints" (ii. 1-22). The third chapter begins with a reference to i. 1-14 as furnishing occasion for thankfulness and prayer, but the course of thought is immediately broken off by the intrusion of a thought about the gentile Christians (iii. 1-13). The subject is resumed in iii. 13-21. The rest of the Epistle is occupied with various exhortations not easily summarised.

The address of the Epistle is doubtful. The words "in Ephesus" stand in all the ancient versions and in all the manuscripts except the Sinaitic and the Vatican. They are omitted in the former, and in the latter are written in the margin by another hand than that of the copyist. Tischendorf places them in brackets, and remarks that he does not regard them as from the author of the Epistle. Origen's text did not contain them, and Basil the Great says that they were wanting in the text known to his predecessors, and that he had found them to be absent in ancient copies. Jerome was acquainted with this text; but remarks that others suppose that the saints in Ephesus were addressed. Tertullian says that the orthodox Christians have the Epistle as addressed to the Ephesians, but the heretics as addressed to the Laodiceans. The Epistle contains no internal evidence of having been addressed to the Ephesians. According to Acts xviii. 19, 20, xix. 8, 13-16, 34, there was a considerable Jewish-Christian element in the church in Ephesus; but the Epistle is directed and adapted to gentile-Christian readers (ii. 1, 2, 11-13, 19, iii. 1, 6, iv. 17, 22, v.

8), and scarcely a trace of Jewish readers can be found in it. How the words "in Ephesus" came to be inserted in the text of some ancient manuscripts is altogether a matter of conjecture.

Addressed to gentile Christians, one leading object of the Epistle is to show that they stand on an equality with the Jewish-Christian believers, and should be fully united with them in the unity of one great Church of Christ. This "body of Christ," its building up, and its oneness must be regarded as the one leading idea to which for the most part the other conceptions of the Epistle are subordinated. Accordingly it has been noted that the sections especially devoted to this point (ii. 11-22, iv. 1-16) show the most independence, while other portions are in a greater degree dependent on the Pauline Epistles. A doctrine of the person of Christ is set forth very much after the manner of Colossians, and he is said to have ascended far above all the heavens, that he might fill all things (iv. 10); but the writer does not lose sight of his main object even when touching upon this cosmic greatness of Christ. Rather for him the consummation of all desirable things is that "we all attain unto the unity of the faith," and "grow up in all things into him which is the Head, even Christ" (iv. 13, 15). Christ is indeed "above all rule and authority and power and dominion" as in Colossians, but his exaltation is to the end that he may be "head over all things to the Church, which is his body" (i. 21, 22). He "broke down the middle wall of partition" between Jew and gentile, "that he might reconcile both in one body unto God through the cross." This "one body" is Christ who is "the chief corner-stone, in whom each several building groweth into a holy temple in the Lord" (ii. 20, 21).

It is doubtful whether any specific false teaching was in the mind of the writer, against which he wished to warn his readers. The absence of local colour, personal reference,

greetings, etc., renders it improbable that the Epistle was addressed to a particular church. The writer appears to have in mind the needs of Christians generally in his time with special reference to the one main object previously mentioned and to modes of life which called for exhortation and admonition. The letter has the character of a catholic or general Epistle like 1 Peter.

If we compare the Epistle with those which by the general consensus of New Testament scholars are attributed to Paul, that is, Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, 1 Thessalonians, and Philippians, we find the differences so radical and striking as to suggest a diversity of authorship even on a superficial observation. No one can read it in connection with either one of those mentioned even in a translation without feeling that it is inferior to them in conception, in force of thought, and in strength of style. The supposition that Paul commissioned some one of his companions to write it for him on the basis of the Epistle to the Colossians is rendered improbable by the prominence given to the personality of the real author who either was Paul, or wished to pass for him (i. 15, iii. 1-13, iv. 1, vi. 19-22). If Paul had associated anyone with him in the composition of the Epistle, that person would probably have been mentioned as is done in Colossians i. 1, to say nothing of the improbability of his having assigned to a disciple the discussion of so grave a matter as that which constitutes the kernel of the Epistle, while he was at leisure in prison. As to the Epistle's having been written by some disciple of Paul's upon a basis supplied by a letter of his, the style and general character exclude this hypothesis, for which there is far less ground in this case than in that of Colossians.

Not to dwell on the large number of words never used by Paul, many of which are not elsewhere found in the New Testament, the combinations of terms never made by Paul, and the abundant employment of conceptions seldom found

in the apostle's writings, the entire style of the Epistle is unapauline in its wordiness, its accumulation of synonyms, its stringing together of prepositional phrases of ambiguous reference, and its attaching of genitives whose meaning is conjectural. "Exegetes have long since remarked and emphasised this forced heaping up of substantives, this obscure affluence of expression not always occasioned by an excess of matter or of thought, the broad, wordy, tautological, and often turgid tone, the awkward style, often overloaded with parentheses, in consequence of which sentences are frequently resumed which one has already forgotten." The occasional irregularities of style which Paul permits himself have been well said to be due to the "springing" of his thought, while those of this Epistle, which are the rule rather than the exception, are chargeable to the "clinging" of the writer's thought.

Not only is the style throughout impossible as an achievement of Paul's, but the ideas of the Epistle are in a large measure such as cannot fairly be ascribed to him. The central thought of the Epistle is that of the Church as an indistinguishable unity of Jews and gentiles. But the relation of the Church to Christ is conceived in a manner unknown to Paul, in whose thought the individual believers are together "one body in Christ."¹ But here Christ is the head of the Church, which is conceived as his "body" (iv. 15, v. 23). The term "body," which was employed by the apostle generally for a single church, becomes here a designation of Christianity as a whole. The "churches" of Paul give place to "the Church" as a unity, and the saving work of Christ concerns it as such, while individuals are subordinate to it. It is furthermore contrary to all that we know of Paul from his undisputed Epistles that he should address a letter to the gentile Christians in which the Jews and gentiles are distinguished as here from each other by the frequent "we"

¹ Rom. xii. 5 ; 1 Cor. xii. 13.

and "you." To Paul there was in Christ neither Jew nor gentile.¹ The almost entire absence of the great Pauline doctrine of justification through faith is an indication of a time and point of view long after the apostle's polemic on this subject. Paul never uses the expression, "the holy apostles," and it can only be regarded as "the rhetorical product of a time remote from the apostles."

The death of Christ, so prominent in the Pauline Epistles, is here retired into the background. In one passage only, which is adopted from Colossians, "redemption through his blood" is mentioned. But the work of Christ is not conceived in accordance with the Pauline thought. Christ is the immediate reconciling principal, not a means or agent through whom God reconciles (ii. 14, 16).² Rather after the manner of Hebrews than of Paul Christ's death is spoken of as an "offering, a sacrifice to God for an odour of a sweet smell" (v. 2). The removal of the law through the death of Christ (ii. 14-16) is in order that the enmity between Jews and gentiles may be taken away, and no stress is laid in Paul's doctrine on the abolishing of the individual's sin and his reconciliation to God whereby, the law of the Spirit having taken the place of the old law of works, he comes into the freedom of a child of God.

The doctrine of the Epistle concerning Christ centres in his relation to the Church as an historical, or perhaps rather cosmical, entity and unity. He "nourishes and cherishes" it (v. 29). As a man shall leave his father and mother, and cleave unto his wife, and the twain shall become one flesh, so with Christ in relation to the Church. He descends from heaven to the earth, and distributes "gifts" to the Church, or establishes officers and determines their functions (iv. 8-11). Accordingly, he is present in the Church, which in him as "the corner-stone" "groweth into a holy temple in the Lord." Not only is the Church the "body" of Christ,

¹ Gal. iii. 28.

² Rom. v. 10; 2 Cor. v. 18.

but his "fulness" ¹ (i. 23, iv. 13), "the fulness of him that filleth all in all." This is quite unlike Paul, and finds its explanation only in an historical setting unknown to him, that of a Church seeking for a principle of union in a time when the absorbing question was not as with him how the individual might be saved by faith, but how the Church as a whole might "attain unto the unity of the faith" (iv. 13).

In accordance with this point of view the problem of the future is not, as in the apostle's thought, concerned with the fortune of the individual believer at the second coming of Christ, and the great consummation is not conceived as effected by the victorious and descending Lord, but through the instrumentality of the Church, his "body." The personal coming of Jesus to judgment, which was so conspicuous an object of Paul's thought and "earnest expectation," is not even mentioned in the Epistle. Christ is not himself to put down "all rule and authority and power" of the opposing spirits of evil,² but it is "through the Church" that "to the principalities and powers in the heavenly places" are to "be made known the manifold wisdom of God." The glorious "age to come" (i. 21, iv. 30) is not indeed lost sight of, but Christ's part in its consummation is disregarded in the writer's preoccupation with his coming to the Church.

The relation of the Epistle to other New Testament writings is unique. Its dependence upon the letters traditionally ascribed to Paul is such that it is filled with verbal accords with all of them except 2 Thessalonians and the Pastoral Epistles, 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus. Its relation to Colossians presents a difficult problem which has received conflicting solutions. Some portions of it are partly amplifications of Colossians and partly verbal parallels; some are reproductions of passages in Colossians; some are exact parallels. "Out of the 155 verses in Ephesians 78 contain expressions

¹ πλήρωμα.

² 1 Cor. xv. 24.

identical with those in the Colossian letter." Those who regard both Epistles as the work of Paul think that he reproduced his own thoughts with the same verbal expression. The improbability of this supposition is apparent to anyone who compares the undisputed Epistles of the apostle with one another. The priority of Colossians and the consequent dependence of Ephesians upon it may be regarded as established beyond reasonable doubt by recent investigations of the most careful and thorough character. On this account as well as for other reasons which need not be given here the opinion must probably be rejected that Colossians is a Pauline Epistle interpolated by the writer of Ephesians.

The important differences in the point of view of the two Epistles render it improbable that they were written by the same person. Indications of a late date have already been pointed out in the conception of the Church which is fundamental in the Epistle and in the expression "holy apostles." The declaration that the Church was "built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets" (ii. 20), the "prophets" in question being those of the early Church, could not have proceeded from Paul who recognised Christ as the "foundation," and said there could be no other (1 Cor. iii. 11), who would not thus speak of himself (for as an apostle he always regarded himself, although "the least" of them), and who, if he wrote this Epistle, declared that he was "less than the least of saints" (iii. 8). The post-apostolic age is indicated in the assignment of a place to "the apostles and prophets," which Paul reserved for Christ alone—a time when they were looked back upon and regarded as "holy" (iii. 5). It is incredible that Paul, who had spent more than two years in Ephesus teaching and "reasoning," should express a doubt as to whether the Ephesian Christians had "heard of the dispensation of that grace of God given to him toward" them, that is, his apostleship to the gentiles given by "revelation" (iii. 2), and that he should refer them to a

portion of the Epistle itself that they might "perceive his understanding in the mystery of Christ" (iii. 4), that is, "that the gentiles are fellow-heirs," etc. This doctrine was the central idea of the apostle's ministry, and could not have been unknown in Ephesus, where it must have been repeatedly proclaimed from his own lips. The reference to it here as something that the Ephesians were to learn apparently for the first time from the Epistle itself places the spuriousness of the letter beyond reasonable doubt.

No data exist for determining the authorship of the Epistle. That it was written by a man who was in touch with Pauline ideas is evident. The author was probably a disciple of the apostle's, who, in accordance with the notions of the times, deemed it neither a wrong nor a fraud to use his master's name in order to promote his ideas. Pseudonymous writings were not exceptional in the later Jewish literature, particularly the apocalyptic sort to which this Epistle is kindred, and to make the great men of the past speak to the present generation was regarded as legitimate and praiseworthy, provided their message promoted the cause of piety. The author has been well described as "a man of unusual rhetorical gifts, high mental culture, speculative flight of thought, mystic inwardness of piety, a fine understanding for the ethical consequences of the new religion, and the capacity of a genius as well for taking up and independently working over the thought of others as for grasping at the decisive point the needs of the time and leading to their satisfaction." The place from which the Epistle was written is altogether conjectural. The time of its composition was probably the end of the first century or the beginning of the second, possibly as late as A.D. 140.

THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

EXPOSITION.

After the greeting in the Pauline style (i. 1, 2) the portion i. 3-14 may be regarded as constituting the introduction.

The construction is involved and difficult. Verses 3-6 contain mention of the blessings of the believers, of the ground of them in the foreknowledge of God, and of the end in "adoption"; 7-10 set forth the means of their redemption and emphasise the idea of the divine purpose mentioned in 3-6; 11 and 12 and 13 and 14 compose two parallel groups, each connected by "in him" and "in whom" with the closing words of verse 6, each terminating with "to the praise of his glory" repeated from verse 6 and containing many of the ideas expressed in the section 3-6.

Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ (i. 3).—This formula is precisely that employed in 1 Corinthians i. 3.

Who hath blessed us with every spiritual blessing in the heavenly places in Christ (i. 3).—*Spiritual blessings* is a term for the charisms or gifts which were believed in the early Church to be communicated by the Spirit of God or the Holy Spirit. Hence they are called "spiritual" from their source.¹

In the heavenly places (i. 3) is to be understood literally as designating the locality where God was supposed to dwell

¹ Rom. xii. 6; 1 Cor. i. 7, xii. 1, 4, 31; 1 Pet. iv. 10.

according to 2 Maccabees iii. 39. *Spiritual blessings* were conceived to be *in the heavenly places* with God, and to descend thence upon the believers. The expression, which occurs five times (i. 3, 20, ii. 6, iii. 10, vi. 12) in this Epistle, is not used by Paul.

In Christ (i. 3), that is, as the ground of all Christian blessedness. Outside of him God would bestow no such "gifts."

Even as He chose us in him before the foundation of the world (i. 4).—The author here adopts the Pauline theology according to which those who were to become Christians were *chosen* by God. The "called according to His purpose" were "foreknown," and "foreordained to be conformed to the image of His Son."¹

In him (i. 4) is used as in verse 3. The formula "in Christ" or "in the Lord" is characteristic of the writer, and occurs thirty times in the Epistle. The preëxistence of Christ is probably implied here, in accordance with 2 Tim. i. 9, 1 Pet. i. 20. This election was *before the foundation of the world*, that is, prior to the beginning of time or in eternity.² The expression is not used by Paul.³

Having foreordained us unto adoption as sons (i. 5).—Some read "*in love*" with this clause instead of with the preceding. The *adoption as sons* to which the Christians are conceived to be pre-ordained can only be realised *through Christ*, that is, through his mediation, the "redemption through his blood" (verse 7). Only those who "through faith" receive him as "set forth by means of his blood to be a propitiation,"⁴ become *sons* in the sense here intended.⁵ This is the Pauline point of view respecting the spiritual sonship of men. The method of Jesus is simpler, requiring only love of enemies.⁶

¹ Rom. viii. 28-30.

² 1 Cor. ii. 7; 2 Thess. ii. 13.

³ See John xvii. 24; Heb. iv. 3.

⁴ Rom. iii. 25.

⁵ Gal. iii. 26, iv. 5.

⁶ Matt. v. 45.

According to the good pleasure of His will (i. 5).—Man's will in the matter is not taken into the account.

To the praise of the glory of His grace (i. 6).—The object of the foreordination of the believers is regarded as the glory of God according to Phil. i. 11. *Bestowed on us in the Beloved*, that is, Christ, the "beloved Son."¹ The Greek word here employed is not elsewhere used in the New Testament in reference to Christ.²

In whom we have our redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses (i. 7).—Through the blood of Christ the believers are regarded as "bought off" from the penalty of sin, or the consequences of "the wrath of God."³ The doctrine is distinctively Pauline.⁴ *Trespasses* is used to designate individual transgressions, and there is no question of "original sin" here. The word rendered *forgiveness* does not occur in the undisputed Epistles of Paul.⁵

Having made known unto us the mystery of His will (i. 9), that is, the *mystery* which concerns His will, and is dependent on it. This is the divine decree of redemption through Christ, and is a *mystery* in the sense that it was hidden in the eternal counsels of God until made known through the gospel.⁶

According to His good pleasure (i. 9) is to be connected with

¹ Mark i. 11, ix. 7; John iii. 35; Col. i. 13.

² ἡγαπαμένος.

³ Rom. i. 18.

⁴ Rom. iii. 22-27, v. 9; 1 Cor. vi. 20; 2 Cor. v. 21. The attempt is futile to make it appear that ἀπολύτρωσις means simply the deliverance of men from sin by means of the ethical influence of Jesus, and not their ransom "through his blood," that is, by his satisfaction of the demands of the law on the cross. The word belongs to an antique mode of thought, and must be interpreted with reference to it, and not forced into accord with a rationalising Christian philosophy. The original, antique, unadulterated doctrine of atonement came into the New Testament through Paul from Judaism, and it is not for us to interpret it out of the New Testament because we do not believe it. Dr. T. K. Abbott devotes several pages to this inachievable task.

⁵ Col. i. 14.

⁶ Rom. xvi. 25; Col. i. 26.

made known (see verse 5). *Which He purposed in him.* The text is uncertain here, and it is doubtful whether the proper rendering is "in him" [Christ], or "in Himself" [God]. "In him" has the analogy of verse 4 in its favour.

Unto a dispensation of the fulness of the times (i. 10).—*Unto* denotes the object in view in the purpose of God. *Of the fulness of the times* defines the *dispensation* as a fulness-of-the-times dispensation, that is, an economy which was to be instituted when the time was fully come. The term designates the completion of the pre-Messianic age or world-period which was conceived as about to come to an end when Christ should appear the "second time unto salvation" (Heb. ix. 28). As a significant event in this pre-Messianic age the first coming of Jesus into the world is said in Galatians iv. 4 to have taken place "when the fulness of the time came."

To sum up all things in Christ, the things in the heavens and the things upon the earth (i. 10).—The word rendered *to sum up* means "to bring together again for Himself into one." All things are conceived to find themselves again in right relations in Christ, who is the principle of unity, "the Head" (verse 22). A kindred idea is expressed by Paul,¹ although there the triumph of Christ is conceived as resulting from an abolishing and subjection of opposing powers. The term in question is not adequately rendered without "again" or its equivalent. Restoration to a former condition is implied in it, and the idea of the writer appears to have been that a primal condition of unity and harmony had been disturbed by the entrance of sin into the world. The "heavenly places" also had been affected by the same curse that had devastated the earth, for some "angels" had "left their proper habitation," and constituted a realm of demonic powers.² The "creation," the material world, was supposed to have been disturbed by the sin of man so that it was "in the bondage of corruption."³ In the "consummation of the

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 24, 28.

² Jude 6.

³ Rom. viii. 19-21.

age," at "the fulness of the times," the sin-tainted regions of the heavens, the abode of "the prince of the powers of the air," of "the principalities and powers and world-rulers of this darkness" (ii. 2, vi. 12), and the old earth, which with the rest of the "creation" was groaning and travailing in pain,¹ would be abolished, the heavens passing away "with a great noise" and the earth being "burned up."² In their place "according to His promise" the early Christians "looked for new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness."³ At his second coming, which was believed to be in the near future, it was thought that Christ, or rather God through him, would resolve all this discord into a divine unity of righteousness, and "bring together again all things in one." Then the triumphant Son would "deliver up the kingdom to God," that He may be "all in all."⁴ "*All things*" must be understood as including not only the disturbed natural order of existence, the "creation," which was conceived to be in "bondage," but also the realm of moral and spiritual being, and hence all men and angels good and bad.

Taken by itself, the passage may be interpreted in accordance with the doctrine of universal restoration, including the demons, as Origen understood it. But if this was the writer's thought he was not in accord with other Christian authors of his time who said nothing of saving the devil and other fallen angels, but spoke only of their "judgment."⁵ As to the fortune of wicked men or unbelievers at the second coming of Christ, such terms are used as "vengeance," "punishment," "eternal destruction," and "sudden destruction."⁶ This aspect of the subject is not, however, of importance for modern Christian doctrine, since the end of the world, which these writers had in mind, was expected soon to come, and in the temporary and transient character of their belief their speculations about the issues

¹ Rom. viii. 22. ² 2 Pet. iii. 10. ³ Rom. viii. 21; 2 Pet. iii. 13.

⁴ 1 Cor. xv. 24, 28.

⁵ 2 Pet. ii. 4; Jude 6; Rev. xx. 1-3.

⁶ 1 Thess. v. 3; 2 Thess. i. 8, 9; 2 Pet. ii. 21.

of the event must be involved. Origen's doctrine may, however, be a legitimate inference from the spirit of the passage.

In him, I say, in whom also we were made a heritage (i. 11).—*We* designates Christians in general. The *heritage* is the Messianic kingdom, of which the believers were regarded as the inheritors, and into the possession and enjoyment of which they expected soon to enter, when Christ should come to establish it.

Having been foreordained according to the purpose of Him who worketh all things after the counsel of His will (i. 11).—The same idea is contained in verse 5, only that here the issue of the "adoption as sons" is brought forward. Here also the glory of God is made the end in view in the divine predestination (see verse 6).

We who had before hoped in Christ (i. 12).—*We* refers to the Jewish Christians who as Jews had had a hope in a Messiah prior to the coming of Jesus, whom they, when they became Christians, regarded as the fulfilment of the Messianic prophecies.

Ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise (i. 13).—In this verse the writer addresses gentile Christians, assuring them that, since they had believed in Christ, they were sealed, that is, confirmed as heirs of the Messianic kingdom.

The reception of *the Holy Spirit of promise*, or the promised Holy Spirit, was the evidence of their being *sealed*, and in possessing it they have an *earnest of their inheritance*, since they were *sealed unto the redemption of God's own possession (i. 13, 14)*, or to a share in the blessedness of Christ's kingdom when he should come again. *God's own possession* is His people, and here designates the Christians who are regarded as a possession acquired by God through the atonement of Christ.¹

The writer now proceeds to express his thanks to God for the Ephesians on account of their faith and to say that he prays they

¹ 1 Pet. ii. 9.

may have a spirit of wisdom, and understand how much is involved for them in the exaltation of Christ. They have been quickened who formerly walked according to the course of this world, and have been raised up with Christ. The section constitutes a transition from the preceding introduction to the principal portion of the Epistle and comprises i. 15-ii. 10.

That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ (i. 17).—*That* expresses the object of the prayer. While “God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ” is a common formula, this expression is not used by Paul. “My God” in the mouth of Christ occurs in John xx. 17 and Rev. iii. 2, 12. *Father of glory* is also foreign to Paul, though he uses “Lord of glory”¹ and “Father of mercies.”² *Glory* is a favourite word with the writer of the Epistle.

Spirit of wisdom and revelation (i. 17), that is, the Spirit of God, or the Holy Spirit.³ *Revelation* is a fitting term with reference especially to the “mystery” (verse 9).⁴ *In the knowledge of Him,* that is, God.

Having the eyes of your heart enlightened (i. 18).—*Heart* is a term which in biblical usage denotes in general “the centre and seat of spiritual life, the soul or mind,” and often the understanding, the faculty of intelligence. *The eyes of the heart* is a figurative designation of the knowing faculties which are illuminated by the divine truth.⁵

In the Pauline psychology, which had no scientific expression, and in which a loose popular usage often obscures the meaning of the terms, heart (*καρδία*) denotes in general “the inward man.” Moral functions are attributed to it, since it may be “darkened” and “impenitent” (Rom. i. 21, ii. 5). It is a point of attachment for the spiritual life which comes through the divine Spirit (see “circumcision of the heart,” love of God in the heart through the Holy Spirit, Rom. ii. 29, v. 5). It is the seat of the feelings and affections, grief, sorrow,

¹ 1 Cor. ii. 8.

³ 1 Cor. ii. 10, xii. 7-12.

² 2 Cor. i. 3.

⁴ See 1 Cor. xiv. 6, 26.

⁵ *Ibid.* iv. 6; Rom. i. 21; Heb. iv. 12; Phil. iv. 7; 2 Pet. i. 19.

etc.¹ The function of volition is ascribed to it in 1 Cor. iv. 5, holiness in 1 Thess. iii. 13, *cf.* Eph. iv. 18. In Rom. ii. 15 "the work of the law" is said to be "written in the heart." As in the passage under consideration, the functions of the intellect are said to belong to it. The questioning thought arises in it²; it is "senseless," that is, without understanding in some cases (Rom. i. 21); a "veil" is upon it³; compare "eyes of the heart."⁴ The suggestion is worthy of note that a physical movement in the region of the heart in connection with the inward phenomena mentioned may have occasioned the usages in question.

That ye may know what is the hope of His calling (i. 18) may mean "what a glorious hope is his who is called of God to the blessedness of the Messianic kingdom," or "what a hoped-for object that kingdom is to which He calls." *His inheritance in the saints*, that is, the *inheritance* which comes from God, and which in the Messianic kingdom to which the writer looks forward will be the portion of *the saints* or the believers at the second coming of Christ in "glory."⁵ The expression, *in the [his] saints* is not found in Paul.

The writer now proceeds to show how the object of the believers' hope, the glorious "inheritance," is to be effected, that is, by the *greatness of the power* of God, which is also one of the things which he wishes them to "know."

These they will be able relatively to measure when they consider the *strength of His might which He wrought in Christ, when He raised him from the dead, and made him to sit at His right hand in the heavenly places (i. 19, 20)*. Heaven or the heavens, regarded as a locality, were believed to be the abode of Jesus after his resurrection, until he should soon return to the earth in the glory of his Parousia, or second coming "in his kingdom."⁶

After the manner of the author of Colossians the writer

¹ Rom. ix. 2, x. i.; 2 Cor. ii. 4, vi. 11, vii. 3. ⁴ Eph. i. 18.

² Rom. x. 6. ⁵ 1 Cor. vi. 9, xv. 50; Gal. v. 21; Eph. v. 5.

³ 2 Cor. iii. 15. ⁶ Acts i. 11, iii. 21; 1 Thess. iv. 16; 1 Pet. iii. 21.

exalts Christ in his heavenly estate "*far above all rule and authority, and power and dominion* (i. 21), that is, above all the ranks or orders of angelic beings. According to the Jewish mythology personal existences and not abstract potencies must be understood by these terms. The writer probably mentions the different orders in accordance with their supposed rank beginning with the highest. The "thrones" mentioned in the parallel passage in Colossians (i. 16) are omitted here. These and the "authorities" were believed to occupy the seventh heaven.

And every name that is named, not only in this world, but in that which is to come (i. 21).—As if the list of celestial beings which had been given might not be exhaustive, the possibility that any created existence should be above Jesus in his exaltation at the right hand of God is cut off by this declaration. *In this world*, refers to the then present or pre-Messianic age, and *that which is to come* to the Messianic age when Jesus was looked for from heaven "with his angels."

And He put all things in subjection under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the Church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all (i. 22, 23).—The first clause is quoted from 1 Cor. xv. 27, where it is a reproduction of Ps. viii. 6. In the Psalm the words are used with reference to man, and their application to Christ in these two passages is in accordance with a method of interpretation prevalent in the early Church and known as the allegorical. By means of it the interpreter found in the Old Testament whatever he wished to find. Conspicuous examples of this method are contained in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

As *head over all things to the Church* (i. 22), he is of course its head (Col. i. 18, ii. 19), and guarantees to it, which is his *body* (ii. 16, iv. 4, 12, 16, v. 23, 30), complete security for all its interests and its future. As *the fulness of him*, the Church is that which is filled with Christ, inasmuch as it is permeated

and quickened by his indwelling spirit and power.¹ This Christ who fills the Church is also the one who *fillet* *all with all*, that is, filleth all things with all things, is the all-sustaining principle and ground of all being, material and spiritual,² since, according to Col. i. 16, "all things have been created through him and unto him, and in him all things consist."

This assignment of a cosmic position to Christ, the position of a universal creative and sustaining principle, is a peculiarity of Hebrews, Colossians, and Ephesians. In this respect they go beyond Paul in the exaltation of Christ, though the apostle's undisputed writings contain expressions which may be regarded as suggestions of this doctrine. As it is formulated in these Epistles it has the appearance of a development of Pauline conceptions under the influence of, and in opposition to, speculations, perhaps those of the Gnostics, which tended to a subordination of Christ. It is peculiar to Ephesians, however, that the writer prominently connects the Church with Christ and his function in this cosmic position. It appears from iv. 7-13 that the Church has an agency in the bringing together in one of all things in heaven and on earth (i. 10). It is through the Church that the eternal purpose of God in Christ is to be "made known to the principalities and powers in the heavenly places" (iii. 10), and the contest of the Church is declared to be against the demonic powers, "the world-rulers of this darkness, the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places" (vi. 11, 12). Christ is the head of the Church, and it as his body, "the fulness of him," subserves the end which he is to accomplish through the "attaining unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ" (iv. 13) on the part of the believers. The expression (*πλήρωμα*), or fulness of Christ, is capable of two meanings: Christ may be the one who fills, or the one who is filled, and the Church as "the fulness of him" may signify that it is full of him, or that it fills him. The idea, however, of the indwelling of Christ in the believers, which is frequently expressed in the New Testament, and especially in iii. 16, favours the former interpretation. The doctrine of the Epistle, then, is that Christ fills the Church, is its head, uses it as his "body" for the accomplishment of the mission with which he is charged in his cosmic position. In

¹ Rom. viii. 9, 10; 2 Cor. iii. 17; Col. i. 27.

² Heb. i. 3.

Colossians the believers are said to be "made full in Christ, who is the head of all principality and power," in immediate connection with the declaration that "in him dwelleth all the fulness of the God-head bodily."¹ To be filled with Christ is, accordingly, to be full of God; and our Epistle presents a conception parallel to this in iii. 19, "that ye may be filled unto all the fulness of God." But here, in accordance with the central idea of the Epistle, it is not the individual merely, but the Church as a divine unity charged with a mission of cosmic significance, that is thus God-filled.

And you did He quicken when ye were dead in trespasses and sins (ii. 1).—*In* has the sense "by reason of." *Trespasses and sins* are in fact synonymous as used here, since both denote individual transgressions, and the expression is redundant. The gentile Christians here addressed are represented as having been *dead* in their former condition of unbelief. The term must be understood as anticipatory rather than as expressive of an actual ethical condition. In the usage of Paul and his school the death of the body is the consequence of Adam's sin. To this all men are subject without regard to their spiritual condition. But this universal sinful condition together with individual transgressions entails another kind of death, unless men are redeemed from it in being redeemed from sin through the atonement of Christ accepted and appropriated by faith. This sort of death was understood to be exclusion from the condition of the blessed in the Messianic kingdom, at the advent of which "the dead in Christ" or those who had physically died in belief in him would be "raised" and the living believers "changed" by putting off the "corruptible" body and putting on "incorruption." This was believed to be "life," the opposite of "death" in this latter sense.²

According to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air (ii. 2), literally, "according to the age of this world." The expression means simply "this present

¹ Col. ii. 9, 10.

² 1 Cor. xv. 23, 51; Rom. vii. 10, 13; John v. 24.

age," or the pre-Messianic world-period, a characteristic of which was wickedness,¹ while "the age to come," or that of the reign of Christ after his second coming, was conceived to be one of righteousness.

The prince of the power of the air (ii. 2) is an expression for the chief or ruler of the demons or satanic agencies who, in accordance with Jewish mythological conceptions, had their abode in the air.

Of the spirit that now worketh in the sons of disobedience (ii. 2).—*Spirit* depends upon *prince*. Satan is the *prince of the power of the air* and also of the *spirit* of evil conceived as working in men for their moral corruption, perhaps not as a personality, but as an influence emanating from the devil, as the Holy Spirit emanates from God. Or since *power* in the first clause is a collective term for evil spirits, *spirit* in the second clause may be construed as in apposition with it.

Were by nature children of wrath even as the rest (ii. 3).—After having spoken of the sinfulness of the gentile Christians prior to their conversion whom he addresses as "you" (verse 1), the writer now includes *all* Jewish Christians in the general corruption of mankind,² and declares that the latter were *by nature children of wrath*, that is, subject to the wrath of God, which expresses itself in punishment, or ultimately in exclusion from the blessedness of the Messianic kingdom. The meaning of *by nature* must be determined from the context. That it is not the same as in Gal. ii. 15 ("Jews by nature") is probable, since in verses 1 and 5 the "death" to which gentiles and Jews are said to be subject is declared to have resulted from *trespasses*. The idea of inborn or native depravity is incompatible with this teaching, which is according to the Pauline doctrine of sin. Paul says that in the great day of the Messianic judgment God "will render to every man according to his works" wrath, indig-

¹ Rom. xii. 2 ; 2 Cor. iv. 4 ; Eph. vi. 12.

² Rom. i.-iii.

nation, etc., upon every soul of man that worketh evil.”¹ It is possible, however, that contrary to Rom. ix. 4, xi. 21, 24 the writer intended to place Jews and gentiles upon the same footing, and to declare that the former were sinners *by nature*, that is, apart from their covenant-condition, into which they did not come *by nature*, but only through the rite of circumcision. The purpose to bring Jewish and gentile Christians nearer together is served by this method of argument.

Quickened us together with Christ (by grace have ye been saved) and raised us up with him (ii. 5, 6).—*Us* here includes Jewish and gentile Christians. *Quickened us together with him* has the same meaning as in Col. ii. 13. To be given life together with Christ expresses the opposite of “death,” and accordingly means, made to share with him the blessedness of the kingdom which he was expected soon to come to establish. This “life” so near and so certain to the early Christians is spoken of as already entered upon. In verse 7 it is referred to as to be consummated “in the ages to come,” or the Messianic world-period. This context and that of i. 18 exclude the interpretation in the sense of an ethical making alive of which there is no intimation in the passage or in its connection. The Pauline usage is preponderatingly in accord with the interpretation here favoured. *By grace*, the writer informs his readers, in accordance with the Pauline doctrine,² are they to become partakers of this Messianic salvation.

The Pauline doctrine that upon the resurrection of Christ depends the believers’ hope of a resurrection at his second coming (Paul does not clearly teach the resurrection of any but those who had died “in Christ”) is expressed in *raised us up with him*. This expression occurs only in Col. ii. 12, iii. 1. *And made us to sit with him in the heavenly places in*

¹ Rom. ii. 5–10; see also Rom. i. 18, vii. 7.

² 1 Cor. xv. 10. See Cone, “Paul, the Man,” etc., chap. ix.

Christ Jesus (ii. 6). As Christ had been exalted to the heavenly regions (i. 20), the believers who are to be partakers of the "life" in the coming kingdom are conceived as destined to share in his dominion, according to the thought of one of the writers contemporary with our author: "If we endure, we shall also reign with him."¹ Paul also assigned the believers to a position of exalted dignity in the Messianic reign, when he declared that they would judge "the saints" and "angels."²

That in the ages to come (ii. 7).—These words do not occur elsewhere in the New Testament in the Greek form here employed. They are an expression for the Messianic age, which was to be ushered in, as was believed, by the second coming of Christ. The singular form, "the age to come," is of frequent occurrence.

For by grace have ye been saved through faith, etc. (ii. 8, 9).—This is the Pauline doctrine, though Paul never employs the Greek perfect participle used here (see verse 5). *Faith* in the atonement made by Christ is the condition required on the part of man of participation in the Messianic salvation which was conceived as consisting of the blessedness of the kingdom soon to come.³ *Grace* was God's part in the transaction. To Him so far as His justice was related to the sinner, Christ was "the end of the law," as well as to the believer,⁴ and He could be gracious to the sinner because Christ had satisfied the law.

For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works, etc. (ii. 10).—The argument is that the believers could not of themselves or through works have obtained the salvation of the Messianic kingdom, for what they then were as Christians they owed to God who had *created them in Christ for good works*. Compare the words of Paul: "If any

¹ Tim. ii. 12.

² 1 Cor. vi. 2.

³ Rom. iii. 25, xi. 32; Gal. ii. 16.

⁴ Rom. x. 4.

man is in Christ he is a new creature.”¹ Good works, according to this doctrine, followed naturally after a man had become a “new creation” in “Christ,”² but salvation could not be gained by any “works” that he might do before. The “salvation” which these writers had in mind was admission to the Messianic kingdom, when Christ should come again—a state of blessedness which might well be regarded as a “gift of God.” It was not character, which must be acquired by works and cannot be a “gift.”

Which God afore prepared that we should walk in them (ii. 10).—This is perhaps equivalent to “prepared us for good works.” Since the redeemed believer, the believer in the state of redemption, is God’s creation, the “good works” which he in that condition performs must be attributed to God or *prepared* by Him.

The peace between Jews and gentiles and the union of both in one body or the Church as the result of Christ’s atonement constitutes the subject of the next section (ii. 11-22).

Wherefore remember (ii. 11).—A conclusion from verses 4-10, that is, since you have been favoured with so great a grace, and have so splendid a promise for the future, bear in mind that you gentiles, who are jeered at by the Jews as uncircumcised, were *at that time separate from Christ, alienated from the commonwealth of Israel*.

It is uncertain to what period *at that time* (ii. 12) refers. The separation of the gentiles from Christ may be that which existed prior to his earthly mission, in which case the gentiles as a class historically regarded, and not those addressed, would be meant. Or reference may be had only to the gentiles living since the beginning of Christ’s mission and to their condition prior to their conversion to Christianity. The object of the passage evidently is to show the advantage of the Jews and the disadvantage of the gentiles with refer-

¹ 2 Cor. v. 17; Gal. vi. 15.

² 2 Cor. ix. 8.

ence to Christ and Christian salvation. So far as the Jews believed in a Messiah, "had before hoped in Christ" (i. 12), they might be said in a sense not to have been *apart from Christ*. But to be apart from him in this sense has no relation to the acceptance of the historical Christ, which is the question here. The idea that the Jews had any advantage over the Gentiles in this latter relation is not in accord with Paul.¹

Strangers from the covenants of the promise (ii. 12).—The covenants with the patriarchs and especially with Abraham are meant. Paul speaks of the Israelites as having "the adoption and the glory and the covenants and the giving of the law and the service of God and the promises."² *The covenants of the promise* is an expression for the covenant by preëminence, that of the Messianic deliverance of the people, which Paul by the allegorical method of interpretation refers to the historical Jesus.³ See Gen. xii. 2, 3, 7, xiii. 15, xv. 18.

Without God in the world (ii. 12).—*Atheoi* (ἄθεοι) occurs here only in the New Testament, and probably means that they had no God (since their gods were "no gods" ⁴), and hence were without the sense of protection and support which the believer in the true God has. The question may here be raised, but cannot be discussed, whether this sweeping judgment on the gentiles does not require modification with reference to some conspicuously devout men among them.

But now in Christ Jesus ye that were once afar off are made nigh in the blood of Christ (ii. 13).—*In Christ* is the effective power which brings nigh them that were afar off, "without hope and without God." *In the blood of Christ*, that is, by means of his atoning sacrifice, expresses the manner in which the Gentiles were *brought nigh*.

¹ Rom. ix. 30.

² *Ibid.* ix. 4.

³ Gal. iii. 15-18.

⁴ *Ibid.* iv. 8.

For he is our peace, who made both one (ii. 14).—*He* is emphatic, he himself. The *peace* is ours, that is, is a peace between Jews and gentiles so far as they become Christians, according to Gal. iii. 28 ; Col. iii. 11.¹ This is not peace with God in the Pauline sense, but the making of *both one*.

And brake down the middle wall of partition (ii. 14), that is, which consisted of a partition.

This is explained as the *enmity abolished in his flesh* (ii. 15), or in his death.² This consummation can be no other than the union of Jewish and gentile Christians in one religious fellowship in which there is no longer either Jew or Greek.

Even the law of commandments contained in ordinances (ii. 15).—The Mosaic law was, in the death of Christ who became its “end,” rendered ineffective, so far as it was the occasion of “enmity” between Jews and gentiles, when both became Christians, since for them then the law no longer existed, they being in the dispensation of “grace” and under “the law of the spirit of life.”³ The accumulation of terms in the phrase “the law of commandments in ordinances” is foreign to the style of Paul. The teaching, too, that in Christ’s death the law was abolished with reference to the relations of Jews and gentiles is not Pauline. Its historical setting is that of a later time when the idea of the Church as a unity was predominant.

One new man (ii. 15), “neither Jew nor Greek.” In accepting Christianity both have laid aside their distinguishing religious and social peculiarities. Perhaps “the new man”⁴ suggested the idea, and the writer conceived the Jewish and gentile Christians as having “put on the new man,” Christ, and in addition to have become *one* in the unity of a common Church.

¹ See Col. iii. 15, where “peace” is employed with a different application.

³ Rom. viii. 2.

² Col. i. 24.

⁴ Col. iii. 10.

Reconcile them both in one body unto God through the cross (ii. 16).—The reconciliation is not of the two to each other, but of both to God in the sense that His “wrath” (ii. 3) is removed on account of the “propitiation” offered by Christ *through the cross*, and “grace” prevails in its place.¹ The sense of *in one body* is doubtful. It may mean “in Christ,” who is incorporated in the *one new man* having been “put on” by both Jews and gentiles, and who “in his flesh” has done away with the “enmity” formerly existing between them; or it may mean in the Church, which is regarded as Christ’s “body.” If the former view be adopted the words *through his cross* appear to be superfluous, and this circumstance together with the analogy of the use of “body” in the Epistle inclines the judgment to the latter interpretation. In either case while the idea of atonement is Pauline, that of peace between the two parties goes beyond Paul.

And he came, and preached peace to you that were afar off and peace to them that were nigh (ii. 17), that is, to gentiles and to Jews. A series of acts is implied in the establishment of the peace (vv. 14-16) “through the cross” and afterward the preaching of it. Hence it cannot be the personal preaching by Christ himself that is meant, and we have our choice between the promulgation of it through the Church, whose head he is, or, by the Holy Spirit manifested through the believers.

For through him we both have our access in one Spirit unto the Father (ii. 18).—Since according to verse 3 both Jews and gentiles were “children of wrath,” and as such could not have access to God whose disposition was not favourable to their reception, it was conceived to be *through Christ* that the hindrance was removed in his atoning sacrifice for sin.² *One Spirit*. See i. 14, and the commentary on the passage.

Built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets (ii. 20).—“The household of God” (verse 19) probably sug-

¹ Col. i. 22; Rom. v. 10; 2 Cor. v. 18.

² Rom. v. 1, 2.

gested to the writer the figure here employed. *The foundation of the apostles and prophets* may mean either the foundation laid by them, or the foundation which they are. The fact that Paul says, "I laid a foundation,"¹ is not a reason for the former interpretation; for Paul's "foundation" was Christ, and the passage under consideration was probably suggested by that in Corinthians, but altered in correspondence with the expression "holy apostles and prophets" (iii. 5) in accordance with the point of view of a later age. *The prophets* were undoubtedly those of the primitive Church, but that Paul should have ranked them with *the apostles* is in the highest degree improbable. Just as Paul, moreover, makes the "foundation" personal in Christ, so here it is personal in *the apostles and prophets*, but the divergence from Paul is evident.

In whom each several building, fitly framed together groweth into a holy temple in the Lord (ii. 21).—*The chief corner-stone is Christ*² *in whom*, etc. It is doubtful whether *each several building* is the correct rendering in the sense of the several distinct churches, since the writer nowhere refers to single churches along with the one Church. This interpretation is, however, grammatical. On the other hand the Greek does not admit of the rendering "the whole building" regarded as a unity or totality. But "all the building" considered with reference to its parts, especially the Jewish and gentile Christians, is probably the writer's meaning.

Groweth into a holy temple in the Lord (ii. 21).—The Church in its completed form is *the holy temple in the Lord*, Christ. Since but one temple was known to the Jewish religion from which the term is taken, *the holy temple* is probably the correct rendering. The article in the Greek was not essential to the expression of this idea. It is futile to inquire whether *in the Lord* is to be connected with *growth*, with

¹ 1 Cor. iii. 10.

² 1 Pet. ii. 6.

holy, or with holy temple. In Christ the temple has its existence or its growth, and out of him there would be no Church, no "life."

In whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God in the Spirit (ii. 22). — Ye also, as a part of "all the building." *For (or unto) a habitation of God in the Spirit.* By means of the Spirit dwelling in your church (1 Cor. iii. 16 ; 2 Cor. vi. 16).

The writer, personating Paul, expounds the ministry to the gentiles, and prays that his readers may be strengthened in the inward man, and grounded in love, etc. (iii. 1–21).

For this cause (iii. 1).—The sentence begun with these words is broken off at *gentiles*, and resumed with verse 14.

If so be that ye have heard of the dispensation of that grace of God which was given me to you-ward (iii. 2).¹—The personal acquaintance of the Ephesian Church with the writer is excluded by these words. The most that the particle can mean here is "if indeed," "on the assumption that"—a form of expression highly improbable in the case of a teacher who had lived for more than two years among the persons addressed. Paul could not have so written to any church with the establishment of which he had been connected. On *grace of God* see Gal. ii. 9; Rom. xii. 3, xv. 15; 1 Cor. i. 4, and in connection with ii. 20, 21, see 1 Cor. iii. 10. The dispensation was in *the grace of God*.

How that by revelation was made known unto me the mystery (iii. 3).—The writer essentially employs Paul's expression as to the manner in which the ministry to the gentiles was made known to him, but he modifies it from "through revelation" to "according to revelation," or "in the form of revelation" by a change of the Greek preposition.² *The*

¹ Col. i. 25.

² κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν instead of δι' ἀποκάλυψεως. See Gal. ii. 12.

mystery is the idea of the inclusion of the gentiles in the Messianic kingdom.¹

As I wrote before in a few words (iii. 3).—The reference is to a preceding portion of the Epistle as in 1 Pet. v. 12. Probably the section which the writer had in mind includes i. 20-ii. 22.

Whereby when ye read ye can perceive my understanding in the mystery of Christ (iii. 4).—See Col. ii. 2. Paul would not have been likely to refer to his letter to prove to readers who had known him that he had an *understanding* of the great subject of his ministry.

His holy apostles and prophets in the Spirit (iii. 5).—As in ii. 20, *prophets* refers to those of the Christians who had the charism or “gift” of prophecy.² Paul could not have mentioned these persons with the *apostles*, and would hardly have applied to either or both the epithet *holy*.

That the gentiles are fellow-heirs and fellow-members of the body (iii. 6).—This is the “mystery” “not made known in other generations unto the sons of men.”³ As fellow-heirs the gentiles were to be admitted with the Jews, to whom belonged the promise,⁴ to the blessedness of the Messianic kingdom. Thus they would become *fellow-partakers of the promise*, though out of Christ they had been “strangers from the covenants of the promise” (ii. 12). This fortune was to be theirs *in Christ Jesus through the gospel*.

Whereof I was made a minister (iii. 7).—The word is *διάκονος*, which according to Trench “represents the servant in his activity for the *work*, not in his relation either servile, as that of the *δούλος*, servant, slave, or more voluntary, as in the case of the *θεράπων* to a *person*.” The English derivative is “*deacon*.” Paul once uses *ὑπηρέτης*,⁵ which like *διάκονος* denotes the relation of servant, service,

¹ See i. 9 and iii. 6.

³ Col. i. 26.

² 1 Cor. xii. 10.

⁴ Gal. iii. 29; Heb. vi. 17.

⁵ 1 Cor. iv. 1.

subordination, etc.,—the former from “rower,” the latter perhaps from “runner.”

Less than the least of all the saints (iii. 8).—This was perhaps suggested by “the least of the apostles” (1 Cor. xv 9), but, since *saints* means all the Christians, the expression of humility far surpasses that of this passage, and is a feature indicative of the questionable Pauline authorship.¹

The unsearchable riches of Christ (iii. 8).²—This “mystery” of the gospel is too profound for the comprehension of the human mind.

And to make all men see what is the dispensation of the mystery (iii. 9).—*All men* is omitted by Tischendorf and some other textual critics, in which case the passage must read, “and to bring to light,” etc. *Hid in God who created all things*. A variation of verse 5. “Through Christ” is added in some manuscripts.

To the intent that now unto the principalities and the powers in the heavenly places (iii. 10).—*To the intent* relates to the clause, *been hid in God* (verse 9). The doctrine of this passage is not elsewhere expressed in the New Testament. God is represented as having “from all ages” kept concealed the “mystery” of the gospel to the gentiles in order that now, in this present age, He may make it known to the angelic beings *through the Church*. One can hardly think of Paul as soaring in such a region of thought. How the Church was to make this communication we are not told. Perhaps the writer had in mind the influence of the united Church, “the holy temple,” “the habitation of God in the Spirit” (ii. 21, 22, iv. 16), upon the angels regarded as beholding its development. This spectacle would reveal to

¹ It is, to say the least, highly improbable that the great apostle should have placed himself below the believers, his converts, whom, although he calls them “saints,” he censures for their carnality, and reprimands for various irregularities (1 Cor. iii. 2, 3, vi. 8).

² ii. 7; Rom. xi. 33.

them *the manifold wisdom of God* in conceiving a plan of redemption inclusive of gentiles as well as of Jews.

According to the eternal purpose which He purposed in Jesus Christ our Lord (iii. 11).—The purpose is conceived as one “of the ages” (τῶν αἰώνων), that is, as existing in the mind of God during the preceding ages, “before the foundation of the world” (i. 3) and “hidden in Him from all ages” (verse 9). *Which He purposed in Jesus Christ.* The original is capable of the rendering, *which He accomplished in Jesus Christ*, the Greek verb being “made,” and Noyes so translates the clause.

In whom we have boldness and access in confidence through our faith in him (iii. 12).—Paul employs *boldness* only with reference to men, but here and in other late Epistles it is used to designate a disposition toward God and Christ.¹ *Access*, repeated from ii. 18. *In confidence*² is connected with *we have*. See the fine expression of *confidence* by Paul in Rom. viii. 38. *Access* to God and *confidence* are *through faith in Christ*, because by faith the atonement, by which God was propitiated,³ was accepted and appropriated by men, who could then “draw near with boldness unto the throne of grace,”⁴ now no longer a throne of “wrath.”

For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father from whom every family in heaven and on earth is named (iii. 14).—The thought of verse 1 is here resumed. God is represented as *the Father* of men and of the several orders of angels (verse 10). The idea of the inclusion of the gentiles in the “promise” (verse 6) is reflected here in the conception of the universal fatherhood of God.

Strengthened with power through His Spirit in the inward man (iii. 16).—See i. 13, ii. 18, 22; Rom. xv. 13, vii. 22; 2 Cor. iv. 16.

¹ Heb. iii. 6, iv. 16, x. 19; 1 Tim. iii. 13; 1 John ii. 28, iii. 21, iv. 17, v. 14.

³ Rom. iii. 25; Heb. ii. 17.

² 2 Cor. iii. 4.

⁴ Heb. iv. 16.

Strong to apprehend with all the saints what is the breadth and length and height and depth (iii. 18).—The idea in the writer's mind is not completely expressed, and accordingly it is uncertain of what he means to affirm *breadth*, etc. One cannot determine with certainty what was in his thought. It may have been "the unsearchable riches" (verse 8), "the mystery" (verse 9), or possibly "the love of Christ" (verse 19), though the last is improbable on account of the introduction in this verse of a new subject by "and to know."

The love of Christ which passeth knowledge (iii. 19).—Christ's love for men is meant, or possibly a love in men awakened by Christ, such a love as Christ has. See "the peace of Christ" (Col. iii. 15). The idea of the indwelling of Christ (verse 17) suggests the latter view. Yet a love like Christ's in men could hardly be said to *pass knowledge*, since it would be a state of consciousness. The apparent contradiction implied in knowing a love that passes knowledge is to be resolved by supposing that an adequate knowledge of it is regarded as impossible.

That ye may be filled unto all the fulness of God (iii. 19), that is, "until ye are filled to the full with God." The filling with God and the filling with Christ are interchanged in the Epistle (i. 23, iv. 13) like the indwelling of God and of Christ (ii. 22, iii. 17). This is not surprising in view of the doctrine of the person of Christ entertained by the writer. The doctrinal part of the Epistle here closes with a doxology (iii. 20, 21). *Glory in the Church and in Christ Jesus*. Such a conjunction does not elsewhere appear. But the importance which our author attached to the Church led him to place it in connection with Christ as equally with the latter, or in like manner at least, manifesting the indwelling divine glory.

The practical or hortatory part of the Epistle (iv.-vi.) begins with exhortations to unity and coöperation (iv. 1-16).

Prisoner in the Lord (iv. 1).—See “prisoner of Christ Jesus” (iii. 1), *leading*, that is, to the Christian estate.¹ *Lowliness and meekness and longsuffering* (iv. 2).—See Col. iii. 12.

Keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace (iv. 3).—The Holy Spirit is meant, not “unity of spirit.” The *unity* in question is such as the indwelling Spirit of God effects.²

There is one body and one Spirit, even as also ye were called in one hope of your calling (iv. 4).—The *body* is that of Christ, or the Church (ii. 16),³ and the *Spirit* is the Holy Spirit which is the animating principle of that *body* (ii. 18). The believers were also *called in one hope of their calling*, that is, the hope of the Messianic kingdom or salvation, “the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.”⁴

One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is over all and through all and in all (iv. 5, 6).—Manifestly in this enumeration no order of rank is observed. The “body,” the Church, is mentioned first, and the Holy Spirit next, perhaps because of its indwelling in the Church. At the head of another series is the *one Lord*, Christ, then the *one faith* representing the believer’s inward relation to him, afterward the *one baptism* as the outward sign of the appropriation of his atonement through faith.⁵ The omission of the sacrament of the Lord’s supper is noteworthy, but inexplicable. From the analogy of 1 Cor. x. 17 it is probable that Paul would have mentioned it. The series closes with the *one God the Father of all*.⁶ The *all* here includes only Christians, as is evident from the connection, *one faith, one baptism*, etc. It is probable that the succeeding *all’s* are masculine, and have reference to the same persons. God is *over* them all as ruler, *through* them all as a moving Spirit, and *in* them all as indwelling Spirit.

¹ 1 Cor. i. 26; Rom. xi. 29.

⁴ Phil. iii. 14.

² Phil. i. 27; 1 Cor. xii. 13; John xvii. 21. ⁵ Rom. vi. 3; Gal. iii. 27.

³ Rom. xii. 5; 1 Cor. x. 7, xii. 13.

⁶ 1 Cor. viii. 6.

To each one of these believers, however, *was the grace given according to the measure of the gift of Christ (iv. 7).*—The *grace* is manifested in the various “gifts” or charisms of the believers. “Having different gifts according to the grace that was given us.”¹ These are represented as given according as Christ bestows on one and another a gift of greater or less importance.

Wherefore He saith, When he ascended on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men (iv. 8).—*Wherefore* introduces a proof of the foregoing statement about “gifts” from the Old Testament. *He saith*, that is, God, who is assumed to have spoken in the Old Testament. The quotation is from Ps. lxxviii. 18, and relates in the original to the triumphal entrance of Jehovah upon Zion. The writer refers the passage to Christ’s ascension into heaven and his giving of “gifts” to the Church thereafter. The words are not only distorted from their original meaning and connection, but are incorrectly quoted to adapt them to the writer’s purpose. So the “received gifts for men” of the Hebrew text is made to read “gave gifts to men.” The writer has not even followed the Greek translation (the Septuagint). Paul, indeed, employed the allegorical interpretation, but he nowhere showed such a disregard of the original as is here manifested. *Captivity* is used for “captives,” and the meaning is that Christ in his triumphant ascension overcame the “principalities and powers,”² or the demonic agencies who are hostile to his cause and to mankind, and who according to vi. 12 have their abode in the heavenly regions. How the writer conceived this victory to have been achieved does not appear. The *gifts* are the charisms, “prophecy,” “tongues,” etc.³

Now this, He ascended, what is it but that he also descended into the lower parts of the earth (iv. 9).—The writer argues that the ascent implies a previous descent, or, in other

¹ Rom. xii. 6.² Col. ii. 15.³ I Cor. xii. 8-10; Acts ii. 33.

words, that Christ existed in heaven prior to his descent upon the earth, so that in ascending he returned to his former abode. *Into the lower parts of the earth* does not necessarily mean a region lower than the earth, or hades, but probably denotes simply the earth. The writer's thought appears to be occupied only with the heavens and the earth and the intervening space.

Far above all the heavens, that he might fill all things (iv. 10).—The idea of a series of heavens¹ ("third heaven") is conveyed. Compare Heb. iv. 14, vii. 26, where we find "through the heavens" and "higher than the heavens" used of Christ's exaltation. The purpose expressed in the clause, *in order that he might fill all things*, is grammatically connected with *ascended far above all the heavens*.

And he gave some to be apostles; and some prophets; and some evangelists; and some pastors and teachers (iv. 11).—In 1 Cor. xii. 28 *evangelists* are not mentioned, and here are wanting "miracles, gifts of healing, governments, divers kinds of tongues." *He gave*. The several capacities are supposed to be related to Christ in their origin either directly, or indirectly through the Holy Spirit. The *apostles* were immediately called by him. The *prophets* were supposed to be endowed with the Holy Spirit to proclaim religious truths or foretell future events.² The *evangelists* were auxiliary missionaries.³ *Pastors and teachers*, overseers and instructors.

For the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of ministering, unto the building up of the body of Christ (iv. 12).—These and several objects of the "gifts," according to the revised version, which follows King James' An allowable and perhaps preferable rendering connects "for the work," etc., directly with "he gave" (verse 11), to this effect: "For the perfecting of the saints he gave teachers, etc., unto the work of the ministry, to the building up of the body of Christ."

¹ 2 Cor. xii. 2 ("third heaven").

² Acts xi. 27; 1 Cor. xii. 10, 28.

³ Acts xxi. 8; 2 Tim. iv. 5.

It is also allowable to connect "perfecting of the saints" immediately with "unto the work of the ministry," and read: "[He gave] for the perfecting of the saints to the work of the ministry," etc. This is Noyes' translation. The exact shade of thought in the writer's mind is indeterminable.

But the main object in view is the *building up* of the Church, *till we all attain unto the unity of the faith* (iv. 13).—*Faith* is not employed here to denote the subjective state, the attitude of mind, of the Pauline usage, but rather an object, a doctrine, a confession, in which all Christians should attain *unity*. This usage has for its historical setting a later time than that of Paul, when the whole or catholic Church was striving to form itself.

The measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ (iv. 13).—The word rendered *stature* literally means "age," and the sense is "the age in which we are fitted to receive the fulness of Christ," that is, the growth in spiritual life which befits the fulness of Christ.

Carried about with every wind of doctrine by the sleight of men (iv. 14).—Compare "precepts and doctrines of men" (Col. ii. 22). *Sleight of men*, literally the "dice-playing," "dishonest tricks" (Noyes). If the writer had any particular false and misleading doctrine in mind, he has given no intimation of its character.

But speaking truth in love may grow up in all things into him which is the head, even Christ (iv. 15).—The rendering "dealing truly" is allowable, and *grow up in love into him in all things* is the proper connection. Love to the brethren is the condition and element of Christian growth.

From whom all the body fitly framed and knit together maketh the increase of the body (iv. 16).—From the head, Christ, the body being fitly framed and knit together by means of every supplying joint, comes the growth of his body, the Church. *Love* (omitted in the parallel passage

in Colossians) is the principle in which the growth of the Church proceeds.

Exhortations to the moral deportment becoming Christians now follow, preceded by a delineation of the former condition of the gentiles (iv. 17-v. 21).

In the Lord (iv. 17), that is, in Christ, in whom, and not in himself, his thought is grounded.¹ *As the gentiles also walk.* Some manuscripts read, "the rest of the gentiles" (ii. 3).²

Being darkened in their understanding, alienated from the life of God (iv. 18).—See ii. 12; Col. i. 21; Rom. i. 21. In the phrase *the life of God* the relation of *life* to *God* is that of origin, the life derived from God. The *life* is that condition of mind which begins with faith, and is to be consummated in "the age to come," that is, after the second coming of Christ, in the blessedness of the Messianic kingdom. It is the opposite of "death," which in the Pauline and post-Pauline usage includes exclusion from the resurrection and from participation in the "reign" of Christ.

Because of the ignorance that is in them, because of the hardening of their heart (iv. 18).—Ignorance is here placed in a causal relation with sin—a conception rare in the New Testament.³ Perhaps the comma after "them" should be omitted, and the second clause subordinated to the first, "ignorance that is in them because of the hardening of their hearts." *Hardening of the heart* is simply obduracy.

Who being past feeling, etc. (iv. 19), that is, in a condition of moral indifference.

But ye did not so learn Christ (iv. 20), that is, so as to adopt such a mode of life. Paul does not use the expression *learn Christ*. *If so be that ye heard him* (iv. 21), that is, have been instructed as to him, so as to know what his moral

¹ Rom. ix. 1; 1 Thess. iv. 1.

² 1 Thess. iv. 13.

³ See Acts xvii. 30; Heb. v. 2, ix. 7; 1 Pet. i. 14.

requirements are. *And were taught in him, even as the truth is in Jesus that ye put away, as concerning your former manner of life, the old man (iv. 22).* In him, a favourite expression of the writer's, which means here that the instruction was Christian, had Christ as its centre. The connection of the clause, *that ye put away*, etc., is doubtful on account of the looseness of the construction. *As the truth is in Jesus, that ye put away* is a possible construction, but awkward. A connection with verse 17 in the sense, *that ye no longer walk, that ye put away*, has analogies in the broken structure of the Epistle in its favour, and perhaps gives the best sense, although, *and were taught that ye put away*, is an intelligible construction.

As concerning your former way of life (iv. 22).—If this means, “as something that concerns your former way of life,” it is not a correct translation. If we read, “that as to your former way of life, ye put off,” etc., there is a want of clear logical relation. The structure is obscure, but there is no doubt that the writer exhorts his readers to put away a sinful disposition and sinful practices as the Adam, or *old man*, which to Paul was a figure for sin.

Which waxeth corrupt after the lusts of deceit (iv. 22).—*The lusts* that arise from sin, which is a deceiving principle in man.¹

And that ye be renewed in the spirit of your mind (iv. 23).—*Spirit* is here used to denote the disposition, the ruling principle of the individual, of which the *mind* is the organ.²

And put on the new man, which after God hath been created in righteousness and holiness of truth (iv. 24).—The change of tenses here indicates in the original the idea of the putting on of the *new man* as a continued process. *After* God, that is, the new creation is after the image of God.³

Wherefore, putting away falsehood speak ye truth each one

¹ Rom. viii. 11 ; Heb. iii. 13.

² Rom. vii. 23, 25 ; 2 Cor. xi. 4.

³ Col. iii. 10.

with his neighbour (iv. 25).—See Col. iii. 8, where the figure of putting off the old man is closely connected with the exhortation.¹ *Members one of each other*, from Rom. xii. 5.

Be angry and sin not (iv. 26).—Taken verbatim from Ps. iv. 4 according to the Septuagint. The meaning is, in being angry sin not, a denial of a necessary connection between anger and sin. *Let not the sun go down upon your wrath*. On the ground that a writer in the fourth century quotes these words as a saying of Jesus¹, and that Clement of Alexandria refers to the passage as “Scripture,” Resch concludes that we have here a genuine *logion* of the Master’s which has not been recorded in the Gospels. The evidence is, however, insufficient to support the claim.

Neither give place to the devil (iv. 27).—In an angry mood there is especial need to be watchful against the tempter, hence, give him no opportunity. Paul does not use the word here employed for the tempter,² but it is of frequent occurrence in the post-apostolic literature. In the Clementine Homilies the writer, after quoting the words in Matt. xiii. 39 as a saying of Jesus¹, adds as if from the same source, “do not give a pretext to the evil one.” The conclusion, however, that the Ephesian passage or the other is therefore a *logion* which should be attributed to Jesus does not follow. Its aphoristic form places it in the same class to which the sayings or *logia* of the Master belong, and that a writer, whose references to passages in the New Testament show frequent inaccuracies, should have referred the words or similar ones to him is not surprising.

Labour, working with his own hands (iv. 28), from 1 Cor. iv. 12.

That it may give grace to them that hear (iv. 29).—Grace is here used in the sense of “kindness,” “benefaction,” “favour,” and the meaning is “do good to them that hear.”

¹ Zech. viii. 16.

² διαβολος.

And grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, in whom ye were sealed unto the day of redemption (iv. 30).—The Holy Spirit of God, supposed to reside in the Christian, is conceived as grieved by corrupt speech. The idea is unique, but has a parallel in the "Wisdom of Solomon," i. 5.

Whatever the psychological facts in the case may have been, it is an incontestable fact that the primitive-Christian community regarded its members as endowed with a supernatural power which was technically designated "the Holy Spirit." The conception was not original, but was derived from the Old Testament and the later Judaism. If for a time the Spirit of God had been withdrawn from the Jewish people, it was believed to have returned with fresh and abundant efficacy with the advent of Christianity. It was thought to have descended upon Jesus,¹ and to impel him.² He assured his disciples that it should be in them,³ and in the early Church others than the apostles were supposed to be "full" of it.⁴ It was thought to be the possession of Christians in general,⁵ and this bestowal was regarded as the fulfilment of a prophecy in Joel iii. 1-5.⁶ It does not appear to have been conceived in general as the source of the Christian disposition and belief, but as bestowed sometimes immediately upon those who have listened to the word,⁷ sometimes previously to, and again after, baptism,⁸ and in connection with the "laying on of hands" of the apostles. It was evidently the belief of the early Church that all who confessed Christ were thus inspired and somehow endowed with supernatural powers. There were also special manifestations of the Spirit⁹ in ecstatic speech, prophecy, etc. The interpretation put by the early Christians upon these phenomena, due in some measure to the prevailing enthusiasm and fanaticism, is readily apprehensible when we consider their strictly theistic point of view and their disregard of second causes. A doctrine of the Spirit first appears in the writings of Paul, in which along with a deeper ethical apprehension of the matter are manifest also the prevalent popular notions of exceptional "gifts," such as ecstatic utterance (speaking with "tongues"), inarticulate and requiring "interpretation," phenomena of so-called

¹ Mark i. 10.⁴ Acts vi. 3, vii. 55.⁷ *Ibid.* x. 44, xi. 15.² Matt. iv. 1.⁵ *Ibid.* ii. 38, x. 44, 47.⁸ *Ibid.* x. 47, viii. 15, 16.³ *Ibid.* x. 20.⁶ *Ibid.* ii. 17.⁹ *Ibid.* ii. 4, x. 44-46, xix. 6.

“prophecy,” etc.¹ These exceptional manifestations were, however, to Paul of subordinate importance, although he himself claimed to be the subject of them. Paramount in his doctrine of the Spirit was the conception of it as dominating the entire Christian life and experience, which thus had to him a supernatural character. The Spirit alone could, he believed, overcome the power of the flesh, and secure “incorruption” or the resurrection to “life.”² He thought himself to be a possessor of the Spirit, a pneumatic, from the time when God revealed His Son in him.³ A supernatural divine energy works in and by him whether called “the Spirit of God” or Christ, for he conceives Christ the Lord to have been “the Spirit”⁴; and he does not think himself to be an exception in this regard, for all believers are to him the “temple of God,”⁵ since the Spirit of God dwells in them. The possession of the Spirit is also the “earnest” of the future inheritance of the kingdom soon to come.⁶

Sealed unto the day of redemption (iv. 30) has a meaning similar to i. 13. The day of *redemption*, the day of “promise,” is that of the second coming of Christ.

Let all bitterness and wrath and anger, etc. (iv. 31).—See Col. iii. 8.

And be kind, etc. (iv. 32).—See Col. iii. 12, 13.

Be ye, therefore, imitators of God as beloved children (v. 1), that is, imitation of God becomes you, being God’s children. The imitation of God may have been suggested by Matt. v. 48; Luke vi. 36.

And gave himself up for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for an odour of a sweet smell (v. 2).—This clause is adopted from Gal. ii. 20. *Offering and sacrifice.* This conception recalls Heb. x. 10, 12. Paul does not apply these terms to Christ, but to Christians.⁷ *For an odour of a sweet smell* is derived from the Hebrew sacrificial directions in which the expression is used of a ram offered as a burnt offering.⁸

¹ 1 Cor. xii. 4-11, xiv. 5-33.

⁵ 1 Cor. iii. 16.

² Rom. viii. 9-11, 13-17.

⁶ 2 Cor. v. 5; cf. Eph. i. 14.

³ Gal. i. 16.

⁷ Rom. xii. 1, xv. 16; Phil. ii. 17, iv. 18.

⁴ 2 Cor. iii. 17; Rom. xv. 18, 19.

⁸ Ex. xxix. 18.

Paul, with his sense of fitness, does not employ the expression in reference to Christ, but once regarding gifts from a church.¹

*But fornication and all uncleanness, or covetousness (v. 3).—*See Col. iii. 5.

*Filthiness (v. 4).—*This is a term inclusive of baseness or dishonour of various kinds, and is not elsewhere used in the New Testament. "Shameful speaking" is mentioned in Col. iii. 8, and omitted in iv. 31 of our Epistle, which passage is formed on that in Colossians.

*For this ye know of a surety that no fornicator, nor unclean person, nor covetous man, which is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and God (v. 5).—*The motive for a clean and right life is conceived to be inclusion in the kingdom of Christ, since one should not do the forbidden thing because knowing that exclusion from that kingdom will be the consequence.

The kingdom of Christ and God is the Messianic kingdom which was expected soon to be set up at the second coming of Christ. Those who believed in Christ and practised the Christian virtues would share in its blessedness. Men could not enter it by means of "works," but only through "faith" and the works which follow it.²

*Let no man deceive you with empty words, for because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the sons of disobedience (v. 6).—*See "philosophy and vain deceit" (Col. ii. 8). The *empty words* are probably the specious arguments by which some persons were attempting to seduce the Ephesians to practise the vices mentioned in verses 3 and 5, to which *these things* refers.

For because of these things, etc., is found in Col. iii. 6.

The wrath of God (v. 6) would be manifested at the judgment to be held at the second coming of Christ when the wicked would suffer "destruction."³

¹ Phil. iv. 18. ² 1 Cor. v. 9, 10; Gal. v. 19-22. ³ 2 Thess. i. 8, 9.

For ye were once darkness, but are now light in the Lord (v. 8).—See ii. 11, 12, iv. 17, 18 ; 2 Cor. vi. 14 ; Rom. vi. 17. *Now*, that is, since their conversion (1 John i. 7, ii. 9).

For the fruit of the light, etc. (v. 9).—Compare “fruit of the Spirit,” Gal. v. 22. “The fruit which the light ripens.” *Goodness and righteousness and truth*, Gal. v. 22 ; Rom. vi. 21 ; Phil. i. 11.

The unfruitful works of darkness (v. 11).—*Works of darkness* is a Pauline expression,¹ and denotes ungodliness and immorality in general. They are “works of the flesh,”² “dead works,”³ and “works of ungodliness.”⁴ They are *unfruitful*, since they do not effect the salvation of the Messianic kingdom, but their end is “death” and “corruption,” the opposite of participation in the resurrection and “eternal life”⁵ at the coming of that kingdom.

For the things which are done by them in secret it is a shame even to speak of (v. 12).—*Them* refers to “the sons of disobedience” (verse 6). Nothing in the text or context indicates a particular sort of evil deeds, and it is unwarrantable to read into the passage an allusion to “heathen mysteries,” etc. See John iii. 20, “for everyone that doeth ill hateth the light, and cometh not to the light, lest his works should be reprovèd.”

But all things when they are reprovèd are made manifest by the light, for everything that is made manifest is light (v. 13).—By reproof, which is based upon truth, all deeds of darkness or sin come into the light of truth and are *made manifest*, and accordingly *become light*, that is, are no longer in darkness, so that their true nature can be discerned. In this proposition the writer lays a foundation for “rather even reprove them” (verse 11).

Wherefore He saith, Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light (v. 14).—*He saith*,

¹ Rom. xiii. 12.³ Heb. vi. i.² Gal. v. 22.⁴ Jude 15.⁵ Rom. vi. 21, viii. 12 ; Gal. vi. 8.

the writer's formula for introducing Scripture-quotations, leads us to expect here a citation from the Old Testament. But no one has been able to find in the Jewish canonical or apocryphal literature a passage corresponding to this. Texts having some points of resemblance to it are Ps. xlv. 24; Is. xxvi. 19, li. 17, lx. 1, and these may have been the sources of it, but it is no proper citation from any known writing despite the solemn formula with which it is introduced. It has been conjectured that the passage was a formula used on receiving members into the Church after baptism. No such procedure as this appears in any of Paul's Epistles. The writer may have fancied that he was quoting Scripture.

Redeeming the time (v. 16).—See note on Col. iv. 5.

Because the days are evil (v. 16).—Compare "this present evil age" (Gal. i. 4). The wickedness of the times is regarded as a reason for improving every moment in behalf of righteousness. *And be not drunken with wine wherein is riot* (v. 18).—*Wherein* refers to the preceding clause. *But be filled with the Spirit*, that is, the Spirit of God, the Holy Spirit.¹

Speaking one to another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs (v. 19).—This is a variation of Col. iii. 16, with the substitution of *Lord*, Christ, for "God." On *hymns and spiritual songs* see note on the parallel passage in Colossians.

There follow now directions and exhortations touching certain domestic duties according to Col. iii. 18-iv. 1, with a special elaboration of the relation of husband and wife (v. 22-vi. 9).

Wives, be in subjection unto your own husbands as unto the Lord (v. 22)—a variation of Col. iii. 18, where we find "as is fitting in the Lord." *Subjection* is supplied from the preceding verse.

For the husband is the head of the wife as Christ also is the

¹ Col. ii. 10; Acts vi. 3, vii. 55, xii. 24.

head of the Church, being himself the Saviour of the body (v. 23).—This is adopted from 1 Cor. xi. 3 with modifications in accordance with the writer's doctrine of Christ as the head of the Church (i. 22). *Himself the Saviour of the body.* See verse 25. Christ as the head of the body, the Church, is its Saviour, as will be apparent when he comes in his kingdom.

But as the Church is subject to Christ, etc. (v. 24).—If this sentence had been intended as an inference from the preceding declaration one would expect it to begin with "therefore," or "accordingly." The *but*, however, appears to indicate an opposition to the doctrine which it contains, that was known to the writer, or that he had in his mind as supposable, as if someone had argued or might argue against the subordination of the Christian wife to her husband.

And gave himself up for it (v. 25).—The Church in the place of the individual according to the predilection of the writer.

That he might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the washing of water with the word (v. 26).—The connection of the clauses indicated in this translation is probably correct. *With the word* does not belong to *sanctify*, but to *having cleansed*. The teaching, however, is unpauline, since the apostle never connects sanctification with the death of Christ as its result. The doctrine is post-Pauline, and belongs with the conception of the death of Jesus as an "offering," which in the levitical system was regarded as purifying. The idea frequently occurs in Hebrews.¹ *The washing of water* is baptism.² Paul does not, however, use the expression, which has been regarded by some as containing an allusion to the usual bath of the bride on the day preceding her marriage. The meaning of *with the word* is doubtful. Perhaps the writer had in mind the baptismal formula, or, indeed, the gospel itself.

That he might present the Church to himself, etc. (v. 27).—

¹ Heb. i. 3, ix. 14, 22, 23, x. 2; Tit. ii. 14.

² 1 Cor. vi. 11.

This is the purpose of the sanctification of the Church, and is regarded as about to be consummated at "the end of the age," when Christ should come in his glory to establish the Messianic kingdom. Then the Church would be received by Christ as his spotless bride. See 2 Cor. xi. 2, where Paul, however, refers to an individual church and not to the Church as a whole, and does not represent Christ, but himself, as presenting the bride. Our author has introduced an incongruity into his figure in making the bridegroom present the bride to himself.

As their own bodies (v. 28).—The meaning is not "as they love their own bodies," but "as being their own bodies," just as the Church is the body of Christ. It was a rabbinical doctrine, probably known to the author, that the wife was her husband's body (see Gen. ii. 24, "and they shall be one flesh").

Because we are members of his body (v. 30).¹—"Of his flesh and of his bones" is the reading of many manuscripts immediately after "of his body."

For this cause shall a man leave his father and his mother (v. 31).—From Gen. ii. 24, slightly altered.

This mystery is great, but I speak in regard of Christ and the Church (v. 32).—The *mystery* is the hidden meaning which the writer sees in the passage from Genesis in accordance with his allegorical method of interpretation. Whether the relation of the Church to Christ as his bride was regarded by the writer as existing in the then "present age," or was thought of as a consummation to be effected in the Messianic "age to come," is not certain. But the latter supposition can hardly be established by the future tense in *shall leave his father and his mother* applied to Christ's leaving the heavens at his second coming in order to join his bride the Church on the earth. The reference of the matter to the future Messianic age is probably correct on the ground of

¹ 1 Cor. xii. 27.

the general Christian consciousness of the apostolic and post-apostolic times.

And let the wife see that she fear her husband (v. 33).—This counsel corresponds to the injunction in verse 22 and Col. iii. 18, “be in subjection,” and means “treat with reverential obedience.” Husbands are told to love their wives, wives to fear and obey their husbands. The writer does not appear to have been greatly in advance of the best thought and sentiment of his age regarding the relation of husband and wife.

Children obey your parents in the Lord: for this is right (vi. 1).—This is similar to Col. iii. 20. “In all things” is omitted, and *in the Lord* is inserted. In the second clause *for this is right* is in the place of “for this is well-pleasing in the Lord.” *In the Lord*, that is, Christ, designates the required conduct as Christian. *Right* means according to the law.

The first commandment with promise (vi. 2).—*The first* in the decalogue. The fact that the succeeding commandments have no promise does not render this statement inaccurate, for the writer was probably thinking only that none of the foregoing have a promise, and did not reflect whether there was a second with one.

That it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth (vi. 3).—From Ex. xx. 12, substantially according to the Septuagint.

In the chastening and admonition of the Lord.—*Chastening* is instruction and training, *admonition* is exhortation and warning. *Of the Lord* relates to Christ as the guiding agency of the culture of the children through the fathers. No exhortation is given to the mothers respecting the training of their children. This omission is in accordance with the subordinate position to which the writer assigns them.

Servants, be obedient unto them that according to the flesh are your masters with fear and trembling (vi. 5).—See Col. iii.

22. "In all things" is omitted and *with fear and trembling* is added.¹ The *servants* are slaves (verse 8). On the recognition of slavery by Paul and the post-Pauline writers, see note on Col. iii. 22-24.

As servants of Christ (vi. 6).—See "ye serve the Lord Christ" (Col. iii. 24) and compare 1 Cor. vii. 22. *Doing the will of God from the heart.* The slaves should be reconciled to their condition as according to *the will of God.* *To do the will of God* is not found in Paul's writings.

Doing service as unto the Lord (vi. 7).—Compare "as servants of Christ" (verse 6). As Christian slaves they should serve their masters as if the latter stood in the place of Christ.

He shall receive again from the Lord whether he be bond or free (vi. 8).—In the parallel in Colossians we find: "Knowing that from the Lord ye shall receive the recompense of the inheritance" (iii. 24), that is, reward in the Messianic kingdom. The change of phraseology here does not alter the nature of the conception. The *good thing* done and the action rewarded are alone mentioned here, while in the parallel passage in Colossians we find "he that doeth wrong," etc.

And ye masters, do the same things unto them and forbear threatening (vi. 9).—*The same things* is a loose and inaccurate expression. Perhaps the writer had in mind "with good will" (verse 7). Col. iv. 1 is more explicit.

And there is no respect of persons with him (vi. 9).—The one Master of slaves and their masters is the Christ; who has been exalted "on the right hand of God." *With him there is no respect of persons.* In Colossians this is said with reference to the judgment of the slaves, and is not predicated of Christ.

The general exhortations of the Epistle now proceed to the conclusion of the hortatory portion of it (vi. 10-23).

¹ 2 Cor. viii. 15.

Finally, be strong in the Lord, etc. (vi. 10).—Strength in the Lord designates strength that is in Christ or Christian, since the principle of the Christian's life is Christ.¹

Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil (vi. 11).—The panoply of God is that equipment which He gives against the evil one, the devil, who with cunning arts seeks the destruction of men. The figure here employed was probably derived from Isa. lix. 17 or from 1 Thess. v. 8.

For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, against the powers, against the world-rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places (vi. 12).—The connection of thought is, we must be armed against the wiles of the devil, for our wrestling, etc. *Flesh and blood* means simply human enemies, opponents among men.² The contrast is between two kinds of external foes—men and devils. The demonic foes are named according to their classification in the Jewish mythology, *principalities*, etc. *The world-rulers of this darkness* is an expression peculiar to this Epistle, and is a designation of the hostile evil beings supposed to rule over the darkness, or sinfulness, of the so-called present age, the mass of the people of which were conceived as wicked, since they were not believers in Christ, and would have no part in the joys of the blessed “age to come.” The demonic being hostile to the believers is also called “the god of this world,”³ “the prince of this world,”⁴ “the evil one,”⁵ “Satan,” etc. *The spiritual hosts of wickedness* is a designation of the same evil powers with reference to their badness, while *in the heavenly places*, to be connected with *hosts of wickedness*, indicates their locality. See “prince of the power of the air” (ii. 2).

¹ 1 Cor. xvi. 13.

² 2 Cor. iv. 4.

² Gal. i. 16.

⁴ John xii. 31, xvi. 11.

⁵ Matt. v. 37, vi. 13, xiii. 19; John xviii. 15; 1 John iii. 12, v. 18, 19.

These conceptions, which were brought from the Jewish mythology into the Christian literature, should not be interpreted as personifications of evil tendencies in man. To the New Testament writers the "principalities and powers," "the evil one," etc., were nothing short of personal agents of wickedness, tempters, enemies of the Christians and of God and Christ. Those who do not believe in the existence of the devil should not attempt to make it appear that the authors of the Gospels and Epistles and even Jesus himself did not believe in him, by applying a method of interpretation which would, if fully carried out, remove the doctrine of the personality of God from the New Testament.

*That ye may be able to withstand in the evil day (vi. 13).—*The *evil day* must have been understood by the readers as a particular period of time, a day of preëminence, when a conflict with "the evil one" must be endured. Such a conception must have been current among the Christians of the time, and was probably connected with "this present evil world" [age],¹ "the last days,"² the "grievous times," and "the last hour."³ It was a Jewish belief that shortly before the coming of the Messiah Antichrist would appear, and in 1 John ii. 18 this belief is referred to as obtaining among the Christians, the coming of Antichrist being conceived as immediately preceding the second appearance of Christ, which to them was the real Messianic manifestation. Such is the meaning of the words: "It is the last hour, and as ye have heard that Antichrist cometh." Then the believers would especially need "the whole armour of God."

*Having girded your loins with truth (vi. 14).—*The spiritual warrior needs for his girdle *truth*, as the soldier must have a girdle about his loins in order to be equipped for battle (Isa. xi. 5). *The breastplate of righteousness*, that is, virtue, moral uprightness (verse 9). In the spiritual sense this is such a protection against "the wiles of the devil" (verse 11) as the real breastplate was to the soldier against the spears and darts of the enemy.

¹ Gal. i. 4.² Tim. iii. 1.³ 1 John ii. 18.

The occurrence in Luke xii. 35 of the words, "Let your loins be girded about and your lights burning," suggests the relation of the Epistles to the Gospel-history with respect to the influence upon their writers of the sayings of Jesus therein recorded. Since Paul's Epistles were written prior to any of the Gospels, there is question in his case only of his relation to words of Jesus handed down in the current tradition. To this are probably to be referred the remark respecting divorce,¹ that about the support of ministers,² the account of the last supper,³ and the words in Gal. vi. 2.⁴ With respect to 1 Cor. xi. 23-26 it is questionable whether Paul's account was not the source of Luke's. "By the word of the Lord"⁵ probably refers to a direct revelation which the apostle supposed he had from Jesus. The fact that the fundamental conceptions of the Epistles generally are different from those of the synoptic discourses of Jesus is regarded by von Soden as indicating the slight immediate influence exerted by his teachings upon the thought of the primitive Christians. "To love" (*ἀγαπᾶν*) is not used in the synoptics of God or Jesus toward men. "Sin" in the singular conceived as a principle or power (*ἁμαρτία*), imputed righteousness in the Pauline sense, *κόσμος* as the world of evil men, "seed of David" for Jesus, "faith" as Paul usually employs the word, the conception of Jesus as the second Adam, and the Pauline Christology in general, are all wanting in the first three Gospels. On the other hand, the forgiveness of sin—a frequently occurring expression in the Gospels—appears in the undisputed writings of Paul only in a citation from the Old Testament. The figures and parables of the synoptic discourses of Jesus seem to have exerted no influence on the writers of the Epistles, while their terminology and theological conceptions are to a considerable degree foreign to the original Gospels. Ephesians contains no citation of a saying that can be attributed to Jesus, and it is doubtful whether von Soden is correct in finding in this Epistle the influence of the synoptic collections of his words upon its terminology and elucidations. The expression in iv. 14 does not require Luke xii. 35 for its explanation,⁶ and vi. 18 is explicable without reference to Mark xiii. 33, 35, 37.

*And having shod your feet with the preparation of the gospel of peace (vi. 15).—*The *preparation* is that for the contest,

¹ 1 Cor. ii. 10.² 1 Cor. ix. 14.³ 1 Cor. xi. 23-26.⁴ Acts xx. 35; 1 Tim. v. 18.⁵ 1 Thess. iv. 15.⁶ See Is. xi. 5.

and the gospel of *peace* with God is regarded as furnishing it. The peace mentioned in ii. 14 and 17 may have been in the writer's mind.

The shield of faith (vi. 16).—In 1 Thess. v. 8 we find Paul speaking of "the breastplate of faith and love." It is doubtful whether any doctrinal significance should be attached to this variation. But that the apostle would thus have changed the figure is improbable. *The fiery darts of the evil one.* The figure is derived from the *malleoli* or fire-darts of the Romans. These the *shield* would *quench*, or render harmless.

And take the helmet of salvation (vi. 17).—See Is. lix. 17. In 1 Thess. v. 8 Paul speaks of a helmet which is "the hope of salvation"—a figure doubtless suggested by the passage in Isaiah.

And the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God (vi. 17).—The sword of the Spirit is the sword which the Holy Spirit supplies, and is, indeed, *the word of God*, or the gospel, a weapon of attack and defence (ii. 18, 22, iv. 3, 4).

Praying at all seasons in the Spirit (vi. 18).—Compare 1 Thess. v. 17; Col. i. 3; Phil. i. 4. *In the Spirit* means in a state of mind determined by the Spirit of God, or the Holy Spirit. *Thereunto*, that is, with reference to praying *at all seasons in the Spirit*.

That utterance may be given me in opening my mouth (vi. 19).—That God may give me what I should speak when I open my mouth. *The mystery of the gospel.* Compare "the mystery of Christ" (Col. iv. 3). It is *the mystery* contained and made known in the gospel.

But that ye also may know my affairs, etc. (vi. 21).—This is an imitation of one of the personal references in Colossians, and carries out the fiction of the authorship. The *also* betrays the writer. For the meaning evidently is "you as well as the Colossians." But it could not have escaped the notice of Paul that the *also* would be unintelligible to the

Ephesians, since an Epistle to the Colossians is not referred to in this.

Whom I have sent unto you for this very purpose (vi. 22).—This is an exact reproduction of Col. iv. 8.

Peace be to the brethren, and love with faith (vi. 23).—There is no good reason for understanding *peace* here in a sense different from that in which it is used elsewhere in the Epistle, that of concord among the members of the Church conceived as a unity (ii. 14, 15, 17, iv. 3, vi. 15).

Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in uncorruptness (vi. 24).—The Greek word here rendered *love*¹ is not used by Paul of a feeling of the believer toward Christ. It has been well remarked that the use of the third person in this concluding expression is without parallel, and shows that the writer had in mind no circumscribed circle of readers, but Christians in general.

¹ ἀγαπάω.

SOME DOCTRINAL FEATURES OF COLOSSIANS AND EPHESIANS.

The doctrinal features of these two Epistles which will be discussed here are those that denote a greater or less departure from the teachings of Paul in the Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, 1 Thessalonians, and Philippians. Some of these both Epistles have in common, and others are peculiar to one of them. Among the most important is the doctrine of the person of Christ, which for brevity we shall call Christology. That this rests upon the basis of the Pauline teaching there can be no doubt. To Paul Christ is "the image of God,"¹ as in Col. i. 15, and there is a resemblance between the conceptions of him as "the first-fruits of them that are asleep"² and "the firstborn among many brethren,"³ and "the beginning," "the firstborn from the dead" of Col. i. 18. But "the firstborn of the whole creation"⁴ goes beyond the Pauline conception. The absence from these Epistles of the Pauline ideas of Christ as "the second Adam," "the man from heaven," according to which he stood in an intimate relation with men as the representative of the human race, is significant of a point of view indicating a development of Christology in the direction of a greater exaltation of the person of Christ. In the designation of him as "the image of the invisible God" there is at least an intimation of his divine nature in accordance with Philo's idea of a twofold distinction in God as hidden and manifest. Is not "the image of the invisible God" the God manifested? Again, the most that Paul said of Christ in his relation to the universe is that he was the medium "through" whom it was made.⁵ But in Colossians he is not only declared to be the one "in whom and through whom all things have been created," even the "thrones, dominions," etc., but "unto" whom they were all made (i. 16). He is not only the "beginning," but the end of creation, and "in him all things

¹ 1 Cor. xi. 7; 2 Cor. iv. 4.

² 1 Cor. xv. 20.

³ Rom. viii. 29.

⁴ Col. i. 15.

⁵ *Ibid.* viii. 6.

consist" (i. 17). Paul says this of God in substance, "for of Him and through Him and unto Him are all things."¹ That the writer of Colossians was dependent upon this passage and diverted it to a Christological application is very probable. It is entirely compatible with this exaltation of Christ as the end unto which all things were created that a doctrine should be taught in Ephesians that is irreconcilable with the Pauline idea that the "reign" of Christ after the Parousia, or second coming, was to be temporary, "until he hath put all his enemies under his feet," when he would "deliver up the kingdom to God."² This termination is consistent with the Pauline conception of the subordination of Christ to God. But in Ephesians the speculative idea of a cosmic, metaphysical Christ is carried out in the declaration that Christ was seated "at the right hand of God in the heavenly places far above all rule and authority and power and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this age, *but in that which is to come*" (i. 21). Quite in accord with this point of view is the absence of a distinction between the kingdom of God and that of Christ in the expression, "the kingdom of Christ and God,"³ which an eminent advocate of the Pauline authorship of this Epistle finds "peculiar." The Christological point of view of these two Epistles, contrasted with that of the undisputed writings of Paul, cannot be explained as a "slight modification" which might occur within a few years in the mind of a strong thinker like the apostle. A considerable lapse of time, a change of environment, the necessity of a defence of the Christology of the Church against new opponents and heresies unknown to an earlier time, and the occupation of other minds with the theme, are necessary to an explanation of so radical a change. A marked influence of Philo's speculations is apparent, and though the term *Logos* is not directly applied to Jesus, the doctrine of these Epistles regarding Christ is well advanced toward that of the fourth Gospel.

The conception of the *work* of Christ in Colossians and Ephesians corresponds with the speculative Christology which they set forth. The work of the "second Adam" of the Pauline Epistles, who by his death freed men from the curse of the law, and made possible their justification by faith, is here extended into the heavenly regions.⁴ Paul conceives of God as reconciling *us*, that is, the believers, to *Himself*. But in Colossians not only men, but also "the things in the heavens," are said to be reconciled to *Christ*, and the result of

¹ Rom. xi. 36.² I Cor. xv. 24, 28.³ Eph. v. 5.⁴ Col. i. 20.

the work of this cosmic Christ, who is regarded as the beginning of all things, the one in whom all things "consist," and "unto" whom they were created, is the foiling of the demonic "principalities and powers" and a "triumphing over them."¹ In him, in whom dwelt "all the fulness of the Godhead bodily," and who was "the head of all principality and power" (Col. ii. 10), the writer of Ephesians conceives that it was the purpose of God to "sum up all things in the heavens" and "in the earth" (i. 10). It is incontestable that the Pauline conception of reconciliation, which includes *only* men,² and that of the author of Hebrews, which directly excludes all other beings³ is transcended in the doctrine of the work of Christ set forth in these two Epistles.

This extension of the work of Christ proceeds hand in hand with an angelology developed beyond that of Paul by the addition of new orders of angels ("thrones" and "dominions"), and, since the thought of the two writers dwells preponderatingly in the regions of spiritual existences, with a demonology denoting a marked advance upon the earlier Christian thought. Accordingly, we find here "the world-rulers of this darkness" and "the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places,"⁴ "filling the whole atmosphere" after the manner, as it has been remarked by Bleek, of the representation of the Rabbis and Greek philosophers of the time. Chief of these demonic powers is "the devil" (*διάβολος*), "the evil one,"⁵ "the prince of the power of the air." The "wrestling" of the believers is against these terrible agencies, and they need "the whole armour of God" to withstand "the fiery darts of the evil one." The demonology of Ephesians has been with good reason regarded as a development of early-Christian thought concerning evil angels, which lies between Paul and the author of the fourth Gospel. The conception of a mighty personal power whom the latter represents as "the prince (*ἄρχων*) of this world"⁶ is not surprising to one who reflects upon this development. The difference between the Johannine representation and that of Ephesians is noteworthy in that the latter intensifies the satanic conception by enlarging the number of beings included in it, while the former drops out the subordinate agencies, and concentrates all the badness and hatred in one fearful personality,

¹ Col. ii. 15.

² Rom. xi. 15; 2 Cor. v. 19.

³ Heb. ii. 16.

⁴ Eph. vi. 12.

⁵ *πόνερος*.

⁶ John xii. 31, xiv. 30, xvi. 11.

the great "murderer from the beginning," "a liar and the father thereof." ¹

So far as the outcome of the saving work of Christ is concerned, the two Epistles represent the Pauline thought with respect to its consummation in "the age to come," ² but the method denotes a marked departure from the doctrine of the apostle. The tendency of the post-apostolic age to disregard the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith is apparent here. Salvation "by grace through faith," as "the gift of God," and as "not by works" is, indeed, mentioned. ³ But "good works" are immediately included as a factor not to be disregarded and in fact as predetermined of God "that we should walk in them." Instead of "accounted righteous through faith," etc., we find the unpauline phraseology "forgiveness of sins" or "transgressions," ⁴ and the death of Christ spoken of as "an offering and a sacrifice" ⁵ in agreement with the Epistle to the Hebrews. Instead of "justified by his blood" (Rom. v. 9), the death of Christ is said to result in "sanctifying" men, ⁶ and for the thought expressed in Col. i. 22, 28 there exists no parallel in Paul's writings. ⁷ On the other hand, great stress is laid upon "knowledge," or the intellectual apprehension of the "mystery," long concealed and at length revealed (Col. i. 6, 9, 10, 26, 27, ii. 2, iii. 10; Eph. i. 9, iii. 3, 4, 9, v. 32).

¹ John viii. 44.

² Eph. i. 21, ii. 17.

³ *Ibid.* ii. 8, 9.

⁴ Col. ii., 13, 14.

⁵ Eph. v. 2.

⁶ *Ibid.* v. 26.

⁷ See Tit. iii. 8.

THE EPISTLE TO PHILEMON.

INTRODUCTION.

THE occasion of this brief Epistle was the escape of a slave of Philemon's, Onesimus, to Paul, when the apostle was in prison either in Cæsarea or in Rome. The apostle sends Onesimus back to his master, whom he designates as his "fellow-worker." In Col. iv. 9 it is said that the slave was sent along with Tychicus when he carried the letter to the Colossians. But according to verse 19 Philemon had been converted by Paul, and since the apostle had never been in Colossæ or in Laodicea,¹ it is probable that he knew Philemon elsewhere, and that the connection of the slave's return with the journey of Tychicus is incorrect — a not improbable supposition if Paul did not write Colossians. Philemon, it appears, had a house in which believers were accustomed to assemble. Accordingly the Epistle is addressed not only to him, but also to the "Church in his house" (*v.* 2). The address also includes "Apphia our sister," and "Archippus our fellow-soldier." The genuineness of the Epistle was first contested by Baur, but his objections to it as the beginning of a romance-literature are in part obviated by the not improbable supposition that Onesimus was acquainted with Paul prior to his escape from his master. A few words not found in the larger Epistles of Paul are contained in it. It is in every way worthy of the great apostle in style, dignity, courtesy, and friendliness.

¹ Col. ii. 10.

THE EPISTLE TO PHILEMON.

EXPOSITION.

Paul a prisoner of Christ Jesus (v. 1).—Of Christ Jesus, that is, for the sake of Christ, whose he is, he is in prison. The customary “apostle” is omitted, perhaps because not appropriate to a personal letter. *Fellow-worker.*¹ We are not informed of the circumstances of the relation here indicated, and it is not known how *Apphia* and *Archippus (v. 2)* stood related to Philemon.

Grace to you and peace, etc. (v. 3).—Verbally like Phil. i. 1. Compare Col. i. 1.

Hearing of thy love and of the faith which thou hast toward the Lord Jesus (v. 5).—This clause expresses the reason why Paul is thankful to God. Whether *love* should be connected with *to the brethren* and *faith* with *toward the Lord Jesus*, or *faith* with *the Lord Jesus* and *the brethren* in the sense of “fidelity,” *love* being left without relation to either through the prepositions is doubtful. The translation here given is in accordance with the latter alternative, and affords a good sense.

That the fellowship of thy faith, etc. (v. 6).—This clause is capable of connection with “making mention” (verse 4), or with “which thou hast” (verse 5), indicating the direction of the faith. The meaning probably is “that others, being

¹ Col. iv. 11 ; Phil. ii. 25, iv. 3.

in spiritual communion with you, may make common cause with your faith, and so come to *a knowledge of every good thing* that is in you for Christ and his cause."

Because the hearts of the saints (v. 7).—The reference is vague and we have no means of identifying the *saints*.¹

Wherefore, though I have all boldness in Christ, etc. (v. 8).—In what respect the apostle had *boldness in Christ* to enjoin Philemon is not certain. Some relation to Christ is clearly conceived to be the ground of his *boldness*, but whether he had in mind his apostleship *in Christ*, or was thinking of Christ as the common ground of the religious life of himself and his friend, is not clear.

I beseech thee for my child (v. 10), that is, his convert—an affectionate designation, and touching in connection with verse 9.²

Onesimus, who was aforetime unprofitable to thee (v. 11).—Apparently a play upon the word *Onesimus*, which from its derivation means "profitable," "helpful." In what respect the slave had been *unprofitable* is not certain, perhaps in that he had escaped. A possibility only is indicated in verse 18.

But is now profitable to thee and me. See verses 13, 15, 16.—*That is, my very heart* (v. 12).—By these words Onesimus is designated as very dear to the apostle. See "my child" (v. 10). *In the bonds of the gospel* (v. 13), that is, in the bonds which the gospel places upon him, since for its sake he is in prison.

That thy goodness should not be of necessity (v. 14).—*The goodness* of Philemon in the ministering of the slave to the apostle.

For perhaps he was therefore parted (v. 15).—*For* gives a reason why Paul did not do what he would "fain" have done (v. 13), that is, a providential dispensation is the "reason."

¹ 1 Cor. xvi. 18.

² See 1 Cor. iv. 14, 15.

Both in the flesh and in the Lord (v. 16), that is, both in his human relation as a slave and in his relation "in Christ" as a spiritual brother.

If, then, thou countest me a partner (v. 17), that is, in Christian fellowship, *receive him* as if you received me, as you would receive me.

But if he hath wronged thee at all, or oweth thee aught (v. 18).—A considerate way of putting the matter, "Attic politeness."

That I say not unto thee how that thou owest to me even thine own self besides (v. 19), that is, in declaring his obligation to pay any loss the apostle will not remind Philemon that he owes to him his conversion to Christianity.

Let me have joy of thee in the Lord, refresh my heart in Christ (v. 20).—The word rendered *let me have joy* is akin to Onesimus and appears to have been chosen for that reason as a play upon the slave's name. It does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament. From this point of view *let me have profit*, or advantage, is the correct translation. *In the Lord*, with the usual meaning of *in Christ* as the ground of Christian faith, hope, etc.

In thine obedience indicates his apostolic right to command waived in verse 8.—*The grace (v. 25)*.—Verbally like Phil. iv. 23. See Gal. vi. 18,

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

INTRODUCTION.

THE three Epistles generally designated “ the Pastoral ” (1 and 2 Timothy and Titus) are so similar in character as to warrant a common introduction. In the early literature of the Church all are known wherever one is known. There is no evidence that they were used by any writer before about the middle of the second century. Justin Martyr appears to have known them, and they were recognised as Pauline writings in the canon of Muratori and by Tertullian, Irenæus, and Clement of Alexandria. They are not occupied with the discussion of doctrinal questions or with the establishment of a theology, but their common object is to combat certain false teachings in the Church, to direct its organisation, and to maintain the traditional faith. The style of all is similar, and many indications favour the supposition that the three are the work of the same author ; although each has peculiarities of language. It is not probable that the writer of any one of them used either of the others, but if there were different authors they must have been closely related in thought and purpose. The supposition that the Epistles were written at different times furnishes a natural explanation of some of their diversities.

The fact that Christian writers of the end of the second century and the beginning of the third believed the Epistles

to have been written by Paul does not suffice to settle the question of their authorship. This question must be determined by the relation of the historical situations appearing in them to the facts of Paul's life as they are known from Acts and from his undisputed Epistles, and by their contents both as to thought compared with the apostle's and as to the historical environment implied. With respect to 1 Timothy the circumstances of its composition indicated in it do not fit any known period of the life of Paul. According to the Epistle itself Paul, who had been with Timothy in Ephesus, had gone into Macedonia, and left Timothy in his place to attend to the false teachers. He writes him this letter in order to exhort him anew to this end (i. 3, 4), although expecting soon to return to him (iii. 14, iv. 13). Now we learn from Acts that Paul was twice in Ephesus, once on his first missionary journey, when he remained but a short time.¹ He could not have written the Epistle after leaving on this occasion, for there was then no church there, and he did not then go into Macedonia. The second time he resided there from two to three years, and on leaving went into Macedonia. But the circumstances are not favourable to the writing of the Epistle at this time. For the Epistle requires that Timothy be in Ephesus when it was written. Yet he had been sent away into Macedonia before Paul went thither.² According to 1 Cor. iv. 17 he had directions to go also to Corinth, and was expected to return.³ But there is no mention either in Acts or any of Paul's Epistles that he came back to Ephesus prior to Paul's departure. Again, when Paul wrote his first Epistle to the Corinthians from Ephesus he did not intimate an intention to return to that city, but wished them to set him on his way after he should have visited them, "whithersoever" he might go,⁴ and on his return from Greece he went by determination past it in

¹ Acts xviii. 19. ² Acts xix. 22. ³ 1 Cor. xvi. 11. ⁴ 1 Cor. xvi. 6.

order to reach Jerusalem by Pentecost.¹ But in the Epistle he expresses his purpose to come back to Ephesus (iii. 14, iv. 13). Finally it appears from 2 Cor. i. 1 that Timothy was with Paul in Macedonia when that Epistle was written, and according to Acts xx. 4 he accompanied him on his journey from Corinth to Philippi. Yet according to 1 Tim. iv. 13 he had directions to remain in Ephesus until the apostle's return !²

Unable to bring the composition of 1 Timothy into accord with known events of the apostle's life, some defenders of the Pauline authorship have supposed a second Roman imprisonment preceded by a journey, the incidents of which are invented to fit the situation presupposed in the Epistle. But this second imprisonment out of which the letter is assumed to have been written rests upon the slender support of a passage in Clement of Rome, which is of doubtful interpretation on account of the corrupt state of the text, and upon an unsupported statement of Eusebius in the fourth century. If the work of Paul continued some time after the Roman imprisonment known to history it could not have failed to leave traces behind it. There is no intimation of it in the First Epistle to Timothy, supposed on this theory to have been written thereafter, and Acts is not only silent

¹ Acts xx. 16.

² The question has been raised whether, assuming that Timothy was left in charge at Ephesus, Paul would have written him such directions as are contained in the Epistle. On this matter Prof. E. Y. Hincks writes in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1897, p. 104 : "It is altogether probable that before going away the apostle would have given his vicar directions as to the matters treated of in the letter. In that case the instructions of the Epistle repeat or fill out the initial instructions. We should expect in a writer as practical, skilful, and tactful as Paul was some allusion to the fact. With regard to the administration of church government not only is there no suggestion that Timothy had been told how to act, but the directions taken by themselves would suggest that he had not."

about it, but also presupposes that the journey to Rome which it records was to his death. Such a desperate resort as this invention of a second imprisonment in order to save the Pauline authorship of 1 Timothy cannot commend itself to the sober second thought of unbiased scholars.

The Second Epistle to Timothy is also involved in historical difficulties which preclude its composition by Paul during his imprisonment in Rome. Trophimus is said to have been left ill at Miletus during the journey to Rome.¹ But in Acts xxi. 29 Trophimus is mentioned as with Paul in Jerusalem, and hence could not have been left behind at Miletus. Besides, Paul did not stop at Miletus when he went from Cæsarea to Rome. The statement that Erastus abode at Corinth² does not correspond with the facts, for on the journey in question the apostle did not stop at this city. Besides, it is very improbable that Paul should mention, long after their occurrence, to Timothy events of another journey on which according to Acts xx. 4 he was his companion. A writer assuming the rôle of Paul and having a vague knowledge of circumstances which he did not cleverly put together might place persons and incidents in such relations, but the apostle himself could not have made these mistakes.

The situations presupposed in Titus do not fit into the life of Paul as it is known to us from Acts. We have in fact no account of a work of his in Crete, either alone or in connection with Titus, such as is assumed in Titus i. 5. In the account in Acts xxvii. 7-13 of the apostle's sailing by Crete, a prisoner on the way to Italy, and putting in at a harbour of that island there is no intimation that there were any Christians on the island whom he was permitted to see as in other places.² Accordingly it has been supposed by some that the Christianity of the island was of a later origin. But this gives Paul no opportunity to have visited the island

¹ 2 Tim. iv. 20.

² Acts xxvii. 3, xxviii. 14, 15.

except on the presumption of a journey thither after an assumed deliverance from the first Roman imprisonment. But this supposition allows too short a time for the conversion of the Cretans and the rise of heretical opinions and teachers. Conjectural combinations are possible, but they are of little importance since they are without an historical foundation. There is no mention of Titus in Acts, and though he is several times introduced in Paul's Epistles he is nowhere said to have been in Crete. The Epistle is without historical setting, and has such internal incongruities as that Paul tells Titus what according to the assumed situation he must already have known (i. 5), and gives him a description of the false teachers which he must be supposed to have had from Titus himself (i. 10-14), and which was in any case needless, since the latter should be assumed to know them better than he did. Such language regarding a people among whom he had laboured as we find in i. 12 is without parallel in the apostle's writings.

The appearance of false teachers is the occasion of the three Epistles and one of the principal objects in view in their composition was evidently to warn against and combat the dangerous doctrines which these innovators were propagating. The interest manifested by the writer in the organisation of the Church may have been subordinate to this end, since a Church well organised and officered is an effective means of opposing heresy. The vagueness with which the false teachers are characterised renders it difficult to identify them among the many forms of so-called heresy in the early Church. We find such terms employed of their teachings as "myths" or "fables," "profane and old wives' fables," "genealogies," etc.¹ Among their teachings were ascetic prohibitions of certain foods and of marriage,² and Timothy is warned to "turn away from the profane babblings and oppositions of the knowledge (*gnosis*)

¹ 1 Tim. iv. 7; 2 Tim. iv. 4; Tit. iii. 9.

² 1 Tim. iv. 3, 4.

falsely so called.”¹ Heresy appears to have become a standard designation, and a man is designated as “heretical” who departs from the “sound doctrine.”²

The false teachers are also charged with misleading the people morally. They are said to combine immorality with their heresy, to be “corrupted in mind and reprobate concerning the faith.”³ They are lovers of self and of money, unthankful, unholy, lovers of pleasure rather than lovers of God. They creep into houses and take captive silly women laden with sins, led away by divers lusts. They hold a form of godliness, but have denied the power thereof.⁴ In 2 Timothy two are mentioned in particular, who have “erred concerning the truth, saying that the resurrection is past already” (ii. 18). This was probably a totally different phase of doctrine from that mentioned in 1 Cor. xv. 12, which was a denial that there is a resurrection. Its contents cannot be exactly determined. Perhaps it was that “the age to come” had already begun, that there was to be no future Parousia, or second coming of Christ, in connection with which the orthodox Christians expected the resurrection, and that accordingly men ought then to live the angelic life, to abstain from flesh, from marriage, etc., and be “as the angels.”⁵ In opposition to these teachings are perhaps such passages as 1 Tim. ii. 12, 15, v. 23, vi. 5, 14; 2 Tim. ii. 18, iv. 1; Tit. i. 2, ii. 4. That the false teachers represented some form of Gnosticism is very probable, and Irenæus, Tertullian, and Epiphanius were of this opinion, but the exact phase or stage of that many-sided heresy which appears in the Epistles is indeterminable. That the errors combated were later than the time of Paul may be regarded as hardly questionable, and that they belonged to the first decades of the second century is almost certain.

The organisation of the Church occupies a large share of

¹ 1 Tim. vi. 20.

² Tit. iii. 9, 10.

³ 2 Tim. iii. 8.

⁴ *Ibid.* iii. 1-8.

⁵ Matt. xix. 12; Luke xx. 35.

attention in the Epistles as a means of overcoming the heresies. This is especially the case in 1 Timothy, which is probably the latest of the three. Unmistakable traces appear of a condition of the Church far advanced beyond the time of Paul. Prayers are enjoined for "all men, kings, and all that are in high place."¹ We meet here with none of the conditions of the worship of the Christians of Paul's time as set forth in 1 Cor. xii. 28, xiv. 3, 4, 6, 26, 27, but one office of teaching and doubtless a public liturgical reading of the Old Testament.² Traces of a fixed confession of faith appear in such expressions as: "Jesus Christ, risen from the dead, of the seed of David"; "Jesus Christ who under Pontius Pilate witnessed the good confession"; "who should judge the quick and the dead."³ The direction regarding widows⁴ indicates a well-developed church-organization. The injunction that a bishop must not be a recent convert does not fit a time when the Church was in the beginning of its existence, as during Paul's life.

The requirement in a bishop that he be "the husband of one wife"⁵ is totally unfitting to the time of the apostle and contrary to the spirit of his teaching. The meaning without doubt is that a man is unfit for a bishop if he marry a second wife after the death of his first, since polygamy was so exceptional among both Jews and gentiles of that age as to be excluded, and adultery or fornication would, if intended, have been expressed in other terms. But the Church fathers relate that in the second and succeeding centuries a prejudice existed against second marriages, some regarding them as immoral, and since there is no evidence that Paul in his undisputed writings entertained any such opinion, but rather allowed the marriage of widows,⁶ the conclusion is forced upon us that the requirement regarding the remarriage of

¹ 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2.

² *Ibid.* iv. 13.

³ *Ibid.* vi. 13; 2 Tim. ii. 8, iv. 1.

⁴ 1 Tim. iv. 9-13.

⁵ *Ibid.* iii. 2; Tit. i. 6.

⁶ 1 Cor. vii. 9-13.

bishops indicates the late date of the Epistles. As a counterpart to this injunction may be cited that regarding the widows, who might be "enrolled," that is, put on the list for support, if they had not contracted a second marriage.¹ This is certainly not simply unpauline, but anti-Pauline, and shows how strong the sentiment was against a second marriage when the Epistles were written. The connection of "the gift of God" with "the laying on of hands," whether of an apostle or of the "presbytery," is without parallel in the writings of Paul.² To him the "gifts" were solely by the "working" of the Spirit,³ and the situation implied in the Pastoral Epistles is that of a time when the apostolic conception of an office in the Church was passing or had already passed into the ecclesiastical, in which an *ordination* by a college of presbyters took the place of the earlier direct endowment of the Spirit. It is the opinion of the most competent judges that the idea of a bishop as the head of the college of presbyters was in the mind of the writer, and that it shows itself in the functions which he assigns to Timothy and Titus. The conception of the Church as an organised whole, that is, as "catholic," which we have seen in Ephesians, is unmistakable in these Epistles. Historical criticism must, then, assign them to a period in the development of the Church in which the actual environment corresponds to their contents.

The indications of an unpauline authorship shown in the language, style, and diction are numerous, but the discussion of this subject would be out of place in a handbook intended for the general reader. It may suffice to remark that an examination has shown that out of the 897 words used in the Epistles, names of persons excluded, 171 are not found elsewhere in the New Testament, and 133 are not known to the undisputed Pauline writings. Peculiar families of words and new compounds abound, and the style indicates not

¹ 1 Tim. v. 9.

² *Ibid.* iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6.

³ 1 Cor. xii. 11.

Paul grown older, but a man of a different mind and manner of thinking. The dependence upon the genuine Epistles, shown in numerous contacts with them in ideas and phraseology, betrays an imitator. The writer was evidently a disciple of Paul's, and represents him in some of the features of his teaching, while in accordance with the general tendency of the post-apostolic age, allowing others which are the most distinguishing to drop out of sight. Apart from the dependence on Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, and 1 Thessalonians, in many expressions peculiar ideas of Hebrews are suggested, although a literary dependence on that Epistle is not certain. Numerous expressions similar to passages in 1 Peter have been pointed out, a detailed examination of which shows the probable priority of the latter. Some contacts with Ephesians and numerous ones with Luke and Acts have been found. Especially noteworthy is it that out of the 80 words not found in the Pauline writings which these latter contain 34 appear in the Pastoral Epistles. Since Hebrews, 1 Peter, Ephesians, Luke, and Acts constitute a related group of writings showing many features of similarity in points of view, the judgment appears to be well founded which places the Pastoral Epistles in the midst of this post-Pauline development. In the traits of the false teachers combated there is some similarity with those of the heretics in 2 Peter and Jude. Some contacts with the Johannine group of writings are apparent, but whether to the Pastoral Epistles should be assigned the priority or not is indeterminable.

The time of the origin of the Epistles must be placed in the last part of the first or the early years of the second century, with a preponderance of probability in favour of the latter, between A.D. 118 and 140. Second Timothy purports to have been written from Rome, and the Latinisms of the style of all three, together with the preponderant dependence on the Epistle to the Romans, favour the supposition that they originated there.

THE FIRST EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

EXPOSITION.

The Epistle begins with the address and greeting usual in the Pauline letters and immediately proceeds to a consideration of the truth of Christianity as opposed to false teachings (i. 1-20).

Christ Jesus our hope (i. 1).—Suggested perhaps by 1 Cor. xv. 19 or 1 Thess. i. 3. Paul does not call Christ or God *our hope*. He speaks of “the hope of salvation” and of “the hope of the glory of God”¹ with reference to the blessedness which Christ at his second coming would prepare for the believers in his kingdom.²

As I exhorted thee (i. 3).—This introductory clause (vv. 3 and 4) has no conclusion, but a conclusion is easily supplied. *Certain men*, that is, men whom I do not wish, or do not need to name. Perhaps scorn is implied.

Teach a different doctrine (i. 3).—The word so rendered occurs here and in vi. 3 only in the New Testament, and means, to teach a doctrine not in accord with that which had been handed down, that which was “sound” (verse 10).³

Tables and endless genealogies (i. 4).—This expression is too vague to admit of precise determination, and there has been no little discussion as to the particular doctrines of the

¹ 1 Thess. v. 8; Rom. v. 2.

² Similar Tit. i. 2, ii. 13.

³ ἐτεροδιδασκαλεῖν. See Gal. i. 6; 2 Cor. xi. 4; Rom. xvi. 17.

early heretics which are referred to. The reference to the Gnostic speculations of the second century is probably correct, especially since the Christian writers of about the time in which that heresy flourished so understood the matter, supposing Paul to have prophetically anticipated the heresies.

Myths (i. 4) may be understood as designating the current Gnostic "fantastic fictions" regarding the world of spirits, and *genealogies* as describing the speculations of the Gnostics about the orders of the so-called æons or emanations of the Deity. Perhaps the two terms are nearly synonymous. These speculations the writer says *minister questionings* rather than a stewardship or *dispensation of God*, which is grounded in *faith*. This *dispensation* is God's plan of salvation.

But the end of the charge is love (i. 5).—*Charge* is taken up from verse 3, and its object is said to be *love*, that is, kindly regard for the welfare of others, the love that springs "out of a pure heart and a good conscience and faith unfeigned" (see "faith working through love," Gal. v. 6).

Desiring to be teachers of the law (i. 7).—These were not "doctors of the law" (Luke v. 17; Acts v. 34, where alone the word occurs, besides, in the New Testament), but those who occupied themselves with *idle talking* about the law, with Gnostic speculations, perhaps, as to its origin and meaning.

But we know that the law is good (i. 8).—*The law* is here as with Paul the entire Mosaic law, ritual and moral, which the apostle calls "holy, just, and good" (Rom. vii. 12). The *lawful* use of it has reference to the teachers, as is evident from verse 7. If the heretical teachers do not make a right use of it, this fact does not disparage the law as such. Perhaps the declaration that *the law is good* was also directed against the heretics, who may have denied its value and depreciated its importance. The rambling list of sinners for

whom the law is intended might well have been dispensed with, since it must necessarily be deficient unless it should be extended beyond all propriety. As it is, it goes beyond good taste, and is not at all in the style of Paul. The writer appears to have let his mind rove without a definite purpose.

Abusers of themselves with men (i. 10).—Sodomites, see Rom. i. 27; 1 Cor. vi. 9. *The sound doctrine*. In 2 Tim. iv. 13 this term is employed to designate the right belief handed down from the apostles. Here it denotes the opposite of a number of violations of the moral law. The writer doubtless connected good morals with right doctrine.

According to the gospel of the glory of the blessed God (i. 11).—This is to be connected with “for the law is not made for a righteous man” (verse 9). On *the glory of God* see Rom. ix. 23; 2 Cor. iv. 4, 6. This was manifested in Jesus, and is the content of the gospel.¹

I thank him that enabled me, even Christ Jesus our Lord (i. 12), that is, made me capable of performing the arduous labours of an apostle. The writer is of course speaking ostensibly for Paul.

Though I was before a blasphemer (i. 13).—Paul does not so designate himself, and the word is not elsewhere used in the New Testament.² The occasion for this arraignment is not apparent, and the whole connection is forced and unnatural compared with 1 Cor. xv. 8, 9. “The monstrous difference” between this and all the passages in which Paul speaks of his former life has been remarked.

Howbeit, I obtained mercy (i. 13).—Paul never uses “mercy” in connection with his conversion, but “grace.”³ “Mercy” is employed with reference to his apostleship.⁴ *Ignorantly in unbelief*. See Eph. iv 18; Acts iii. 17, xvii. 30; 1 Pet. i. 14; Heb. v. 2.

And the grace of our Lord abounded exceedingly with faith and love which is in Jesus Christ (i. 14).—This sentence ap-

¹ Tit. ii. 13.

² βλασφημος.

³ 1 Cor. xv. 10.

⁴ 2 Cor. iv. 1.

pears to indicate a want of clear conception on the part of the writer. The sense is that the grace of Christ abounded exceedingly along with faith and *the* love which is in Christ, that is, the writer represents Paul as having experienced the grace of Christ on the ground of his own faith and love.

Faithful is the saying and worthy of all acceptance (i. 15), as if the fact that *Jesus came into the world to save sinners* needed this special corroboration either to the writer or to the reader, remarks Schleiermacher. The expression *came into the world*, etc., is introduced as if it were a current saying. It is not found in Paul and not in the other Pastoral Epistles, but is Johannine.¹ *Of whom I am chief*. An imitation of 1 Cor. xv. 9, "the least of the apostles." The intensifying goes beyond that of Eph. iii. 8, "less than the least of all the saints," and the Epistle of Barnabas goes farther with the inclusion of the rest of the apostles.

For this cause I obtained mercy, that in me as chief (i. 16).—The idea is probably not as "chief sinner," but "especially," or "foremost," and "in me especially," is a preferable rendering, although in the original the same word is used that in verse 15 is properly rendered "chief." *Believe on him*. Belief *on* (ἐπί) Christ—a conception in which he is not the object but the ground of faith in the sense of "confidence" or "trust," is not elsewhere expressed in the New Testament.

Now unto the king (i. 17).—*King eternal*, literally "king of the ages," is not elsewhere in the New Testament applied to God.² It occurs in the earliest extra-canonical Christian literature, with which the Pastoral Epistles were probably nearly contemporaneous. The doxology seems to be inappropriate here, and occupies an awkward position at the conclusion of an incidental portion of the chapter. But after this interruption the writer does not proceed to a new subject but resumes the theme of verse 5, as is evident from the words "charge," "faith," and "a good conscience."

¹ John i. 9, vi. 14, xi. 27.

² βασιλεὺς τῶν αἰώνων.

This charge I commit according to the prophecies which went before on thee (i. 18).—Prophecies constituted one of the so-called expressions of “the Spirit” in the early Church.¹ Perhaps prophetic words were spoken on Timothy when he was ordained by “the laying on of the hands of the presbytery” (iv. 14). *In them*, that is, within the sphere of these prophecies.

Holding faith and a good conscience (i. 19), that is, possessing *faith*, holding it fast. *A good conscience* in contrast with the false teachers, who are “branded in their own conscience as with a hot iron” (iv. 2). *Thrust from them* is ill chosen, since unsuitable to a possession, and fit with reference to something offered.

Hymenæus and Alexander. See v. 20, and 2 Tim. ii. 17. iv. 14. *Delivered unto Satan*. This is evidently adapted from 1 Cor. v. 5, where the expression occurs. To be *delivered unto Satan* was to be excluded from the Church and handed over to “the god of this world” for punishment of some sort. In 1 Cor. v. 5, it is called “the destruction of the flesh” of the subject. Perhaps the story of Job determined the conception. At any rate it was a current idea in the early Church that the apostles possessed extraordinary powers of discipline,² and it is not surprising that legends arose accordingly.³

That they might be taught not to blaspheme (i. 20).—This does not mean that Satan would conduct their moral education, but that through the torments which he would inflict upon them they might be led to see their errors. It appears to have been thought, as well by the writer of this Epistle as by Paul, that Satan was subject to the apostles to the extent that he would carry out their requirements of discipline. His kingdom was thus divided against itself.

¹ Rom. xii. 6 ; 1 Cor. xiii. 8 ; 1 Thess. v. 20.

² John xx. 23.

³ Acts v. 1-6, xiii. 9-11.

The extraordinary authority assumed here in the name of the apostle and actually arrogated to himself by Paul in 1 Cor. v. 3 doubtless rested upon the supposed possession of "the Spirit" (see the discussion under Eph. iv. 30). The Spirit was believed to confer not only authority in discipline, but in doctrine also. The illumination which it bestowed was regarded as supernatural in the sense that the subject of its influence possessed a knowledge and insight unattainable by the unaided human mind. Not with "man's wisdom" did he speak, but with "the demonstration of the Spirit and of power."¹ He was able to declare "the wisdom of God in a mystery," "the deep things of God" "revealed" unto him "by His Spirit," things that "eye hath not seen nor ear heard," "prepared" by God "for them that love Him." Of himself "no man knoweth the things of God," but they are known by "the Spirit of God," and accordingly he who has this "Spirit" is able to reveal them, since he "knows the things freely given of God."² So exalted is the condition of the spiritual or pneumatic man that "he judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man."³ It is the prerogative of the believer to be "filled with all the fulness of God," to be "strengthened with power by His Spirit in the inner man," and to enjoy revelations "by the Spirit" of a "knowledge which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men."⁴ Whatever spiritual knowledge is wanting to the believer God will make up to him by a special revelation.⁵ The "sufficiency" of the apostle is not of himself, but of God who has made him "sufficient as a minister of the New Covenant"⁶—a remark which evidently imports that no higher authority than his own word is required. The believer thus illuminated is assumed to be able himself to "prove all things" and know "the will of God."⁷ The consummation of the Christian life is to be "strengthened with all power" and "filled with the knowledge of God's will in all wisdom and spiritual understanding."⁸ It is deemed fitting to offer prayer for the believers that God may give them "the Spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of Him."⁹ In this "spirit of revelation" they may speak "as the oracles of God," and "minister of the ability which God giveth,"¹⁰ for "the Lord giveth understand-

¹ 1 Cor. ii. 4.

² *Ibid.* ii. 4-12.

³ *Ibid.* ii. 16.

⁴ Eph. iii. 4, 5, 16, 19.

⁵ Phil. iii. 15.

⁶ 2 Cor. iii. 5, 6.

⁷ Rom. xii. 2; 1 Thess. v. 21.

⁸ Col. i. 9, 11.

⁹ Eph. i. 17, 19.

¹⁰ 1 Pet. iv. 11.

ing in all things.”¹ This assumption of special and “sufficient” knowledge and authority does not, indeed, imply a sense of independence of Christ, for it was the belief of the times that the communication of “the Spirit” was through him; but it is not surprising that from this point of view it should be thought that his teaching and example could be dispensed with. Hence the slight interest shown in them by the writers of the canonical Epistles. It was only the return to Jesus at a later time that saved the Church from the subjectivity, arbitrariness, and confusion which necessarily attend the confidence reposed in the individual possession of the “witness” of the Spirit (see the discussion under Heb. ii. 14).

The writer now proceeds to give regulations respecting the public worship of the Christians and the organisation of the Church (ii. 1-iii. 16).

I exhort therefore (ii. 1).—It is uncertain whether *first of all* should be joined with *I exhort*, or with *prayers*, etc., *be made*. *Supplications*, *prayers*, *intercessions*, *thanksgivings*, etc. This accumulation of words including all the expressions of public worship is characteristic of the author’s style. The words all apply to *all men*, and *thanksgiving* is of course enjoined for the meanest as well as the best, for those enumerated in i. 9, 10, as well as for Christian brothers and friends.

That we may lead a tranquil and quiet life (ii. 2).—*That* probably denotes the purpose of the “supplications,” etc., although it may be connected with “exhort” (verse 1). The prayers were not for the conversion of those “in high place,” but perhaps to convince them that the Christians were well disposed so that the latter might be left in quiet; or the object may have been to ask for grace for the rulers that they might properly perform their duties and accordingly leave the Christians in peace. The connection with “all men” is obscure in relation to the object of the prayers. But such a want of precision is not uncommon with the author. *Godliness and gravity*. The two words thus translated are not used by Paul.

¹ 2 Tim. ii. 7.

This is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour (ii. 3).—*This* refers to all that precedes in verses 1 and 2 respecting the offering of prayers, etc., and the object of offering them. God is not called the *Saviour* of men by Paul. He is only indirectly so designated in 1 Cor. i. 21, and then only through the preaching of Christ. Apart from the Pastoral Epistles, the poetic citation, Luke i. 47, and Jude 25, the function of Saviour is throughout the New Testament applied to Christ.¹ Perhaps this departure from the general New Testament doctrine was due to the contest with Gnosticism, which made a distinction between God and the Saviour by placing the former in its system out of relation with men.

Who willeth that all men should be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth (ii. 4).—Compare Tit. ii. 11. This passage should be connected with the exhortation to pray for all men. Chrysostom comments on this passage: "Imitate God; if He wishes all men to be saved, do thou wish it; if thou wishest it, pray for it." See Tit. ii. 11. The emphasis laid in these Epistles on the universality of the divine grace, whether intended to oppose Jewish exclusiveness like Rom. iii. 29 or not, is probably attributable to the exigencies of the strife with the Gnostics, who distinguished between "pneumatic" or spiritual and "hylic" or material men. The one God whom the Christians of this period opposed to the Gnostic "genealogies" was thought to stand in a similar relation to all men. Yet along with this doctrine goes the idea that there are some who are the "elect," and who will "obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory," that those who deny Christ he "will deny," and that only those who "endure" will

¹ Luke ii. 11; John iv. 42; Acts v. 31, xiii. 23; Eph. v. 23; Phil. iii. 20; 2 Pet. i. 1, 11, ii. 20, iii. 2, 18; 1 John iv. 14; see also 2 Tim. i. 10, ii. 10, iv. 18; Tit. i. 4, ii. 13, iii. 6; but God as Saviour, Tit. i. 3, ii. 10, iii. 4; 1 Tim. i. 1, ii. 3, iv. 10.

“ reign with him.”¹ The declaration, moreover, that “ the Lord knoweth them that are his ”² implies that there are some who are not Christ’s. The doctrine that all men would share the blessedness of the Messianic “ reign ” is not taught in these Epistles.

The knowledge of the truth (ii. 4) is probably conceived as the end to which salvation leads, although the idea that this knowledge is the *means* of salvation may have lain in the writer’s mind, the condition being introduced after the result.³

For there is one God, one mediator also between God and men, himself man, Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all (ii. 5, 6).—*For* connects with the immediately preceding thought — the one wish with respect to all men involves according to the apparent course of the writer’s thought the unity of the Deity. The same doctrine is affirmed in Rom. iii. 30 with relation to the idea that Jews have not one God and gentiles another, and in 1 Cor. viii. 6 with reference to the heathen divinities.⁴ *Mediator*, that is, one who intervenes between two persons either to make an agreement or to restore harmony. Paul uses the word once⁵ with reference to the giving of the law, and in Hebrews it is used of Moses and of Christ as mediators of “ covenants.” The idea is not Pauline, but appears to have been derived from Hebrews or from the circle of thought which that Epistle represents.⁶ *Himself man*. The Greek reads, “ man Christ Jesus ” without the article. The only other passage in the New Testament in which Jesus is so designated is Rom. v. 15, where “ the man Christ Jesus ” is contrasted with the first Adam through whom sin and death came into the world. The connection of thought here is different and may be that the offer of salvation through the mediator Jesus, a

¹ 2 Tim. ii. 10-12.

⁴ Eph. iv. 6.

² *Ibid.* ii. 19.

⁵ Gal. iii. 19, 20.

³ *Ibid.* iii. 7.

⁶ Heb. viii. 6, ix. 15, xii. 24.

man, extends as far as mankind, that is to all men. Perhaps the humanity of Jesus is here emphasised in opposition to the Docetic heresy which denied that Jesus had a real body of flesh and blood. But compare Tit. ii. 13.

Gave himself a ransom for all (ii. 6).—The word rendered *ransom* means “that which is given in exchange for another as the price of his redemption,” and the idea is the Pauline one expressed in Gal. iii. 13, by “Christ redeemed us [bought us off] from the curse of the law.” According to 1 Pet. i. 18 the price of man’s redemption paid by Jesus was his “precious blood.” The penalty of the law was “death,” which in the Pauline sense included exclusion from the resurrection at the second coming of Christ and from the blessedness of the Messianic kingdom to be established at that time. As the representative of the human race, “the last Adam,” Christ paid this penalty for men, “having become a curse for us,” and on condition of “faith” they will be regarded as not having broken the law, as “justified,” and will be raised at his coming, so as to “reign with him” in his kingdom, after having been clothed upon with “spiritual bodies” conformed to “his body of glory.” The unconditional deliverance of all men from sin is of course not implied. This fundamental tenet of Paulinism found its way into the synoptic Gospels, and appears there as a teaching of Jesus himself, though quite opposed to his conception of his function in saving men from sin.¹

Testimony to be borne in its own times (ii. 6), that is, the announcement of the historic fact that Christ gave himself as a ransom for all was to be at a suitable time, God’s own time.² *Whereunto I was appointed a preacher and an apostle a teacher of the gentiles*, etc. (ii. 7), that is, unto this “mystery” that Christ gave himself a “ransom for all.” The writer, personating Paul, is careful to add *apostle* to

¹ Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45.

² Tit. i. 3.

preacher. Perhaps Paul's apostolic work was denied by the false teachers. The words, *a teacher of the gentiles*, are an elaboration of the idea that the gospel of which the writer makes Paul declare himself a preacher and an apostle was inclusive of all men.

The writer now turns to exhortations regarding the position of men and women in the Church.

I desire, therefore, that men pray in every place, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and disputing (ii. 8).—Only men should pray in the public assemblies according to 1 Cor. xiv. 34, and *in every place* probably means in all the places where believers assemble for public worship. The lifting up of the hands was customary among the Jews in prayer.¹ *Holy hands.* The expression is symbolical of a pure life.² *Without wrath and disputing.* See Phil. ii. 14.

In like manner, that women adorn themselves (ii. 9).—It is necessary to supply "I desire" from verse 8. The seemingly attire and the modesty and sobriety recommended to women would place them in contrast with those of their sex whose life was not chaste. *Braided hair.* See 1 Pet. iii. 3.

Let a woman learn in quietness with all subjection (ii. 11).—This is the oft-recurring teaching of the apostolic and the post-apostolic age regarding the relation of wives to their husbands.³

But I permit not a woman to teach, nor to have dominion over a man (ii. 12).—Both clauses probably relate to woman's position in the religious assemblies. If she were to *teach*, she would hold a position of authority. This teaching is in accordance with Paul's instructions on the subject to the effect that if the women "would learn anything, let them ask their own husbands at home."⁴

¹ Ps. xxviii. 2, xlv. 21.

² Jas. iv. 8; Acts ii. 23.

³ 1 Cor. xiv. 34; Col. iii. 18; Eph. v. 22; 1 Pet. iii. 1.

⁴ *Ibid.* xiv. 35.

For Adam was first formed, then Eve (ii. 13).—As Paul, following the allegorical method of interpretation, regarded the history and legend of the Old Testament as symbolical of conditions and events of a later time, so the author of this Epistle founds man's superiority to woman upon the priority of Adam's creation in the story of the origin of the human race in Genesis. Compare Paul's declaration that man is "the image and glory of God," but the woman is only "of the man,"¹ and accordingly by implication inferior.

And Adam was not beguiled, but the woman, being beguiled, hath fallen into transgression (ii. 14).—This passage has caused the expositors no little trouble. Some have proposed supplying "first," and others "by the serpent" after *beguiled*, in order to overcome the apparent exclusion of Adam from participation in the fall.² An insight, however, into the allegorical interpretation has cleared up the difficulty. The writer did not intend to clear Adam of blame, and probably did not by an oversight omit to mention him; but in accordance with the allegorical method which often selects a single word for special emphasis, and hangs the whole elucidation upon it, he here presses *beguiled* as applicable only to Eve. She fell into the snare of the tempter, and in the original narration she alone is mentioned as having been deceived by the serpent. See 2 Cor. xi. 3, where Paul employs this word. In fact, Adam's case was not much better since he was apparently so easily led astray; but the facts did not stand in the way of the allegoriser, who here as usual makes out his case, and shows that woman, being so weak as the story of her ancestress proves her to be, is fit only for subordination, and should not assume to teach, but quietly submit to be taught and directed by man. The author of Rom. v. 12-14, 19 could not, however, have written the passage under consideration.

¹ 1 Cor. xi. 3, 8.

² Rom. v. 12-14.

But there is hope for her, for *she shall be saved through the child-bearing, if they continue in faith and love and sanctification with sobriety* (ii. 15).—This idea was perhaps suggested by Gen. iii. 16. Woman's destiny is the bearing of children, and in fulfilling it *she will be saved*, is the thought of the writer. This defines her sphere and she should confine herself to domestic duties, and not let herself be heard in the public assemblies. How much the prohibition of marriage by the false teachers (iv. 3) may have had to do with the origin of this teaching we do not know. There is certainly nothing like it in Paul, and it can hardly be made to accord with his discouragement of marriage.¹ Unpauline, too, is salvation by works, with faith subordinated, and coördinated with *love* and *sobriety*, and the introduction of the plural *if they continue*, together with the loose combination, *faith and love and sanctification with sobriety*, indicates a want of directness and precision which betrays a writer inferior to the great apostle.

If a man seeketh the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work (iii. 1).—The word here rendered *the office of a bishop* (ἐπισκοπή), means primarily “inspection,” “visitation,” “investigation,” “that act by which God looks into and searches out the ways, deeds, and character of men in order to adjudge them their lot whether joyous or sad.” Hence “the day of thy visitation.”² Here it is correctly rendered *the office of a bishop*.³ The bishop was the overseer of a church, and his office is in this connection distinguished from that of a “deacon” (verse 8).

The bishop, therefore, must be without reproach, the husband of one wife, etc. (iii. 2).—The injunction regarding the marital relation of the bishop is not a prohibition of polygamy, is not to be understood figuratively in the sense of celibacy, as if the Church were his wife, and does not mean

¹ 1 Cor. vii. 8.

² ἐπισκοπή. Luke xix. 44; 1 Pet. ii. 12.

³ Acts i. 20.

simply that he must be a married man, as if *one* before *wife* were equivalent to the indefinite article, or that as such he should be faithful to his wife. It is a prohibition of a second marriage after the death of *one wife*. (See the Introduction.) *Apt to teach*, that is, skilful in imparting knowledge, not "inclined to teaching." The word so rendered is found in 2 Tim. ii. 24, and not elsewhere in the New Testament. It does not occur in the classic Greek.

No brawler, no striker (iii. 3).—See Tit. i. 7, that is, not given to wine and not quarrelsome and pugnacious. *No lover of money*. Compare "not greedy of filthy lucre," Tit. i. 7.

Having his children in subjection with all gravity (iii. 4).—"With all gravity" is perhaps incongruously subjoined. The words are at least loosely connected with the preceding, and commentators are in doubt whether to refer them to the bishop or to the children.

Not a novice, lest being puffed up he fall into the condemnation of the devil (iii. 6).—*Novice*, neophyte, does not mean a young man, but a recent convert. (See the Introduction.) *Puffed up*. Perhaps "blinded with pride or conceit" were a preferable rendering. *The condemnation of the devil* is of doubtful import, the genitive being either subjective or objective. If the genitive is subjective the meaning is "the condemnation which the devil decrees," and the judgment must be assumed to be that pronounced by the enemies of Christianity regarded as prompted by the devil. If the genitive is objective the condemnation is such as falls upon the devil supposed to be chargeable with a similar offence. It is impossible to determine which idea was in the writer's mind.

Lest he fall into reproach and the snare of the devil (iii. 7).—It is uncertain whether *reproach* is to be taken absolutely or in connection with *the devil*, "reproach of the devil." In the latter case the interpretation must be similar to that

given of "the condemnation of the devil" under the objective genitive. *The snare of the devil*, a figure drawn from hunting, indicates the perils prepared by the evil one through temptation for the destruction of the good.¹

Deacons in like manner must be grave (iii. 8).—In the apostolic Church *deacons* had the care of the poor.² They are mentioned in Phil. i. 1 in immediate connection with bishops. That their functions were the same in the post-apostolic Church represented in these Epistles is improbable. The word originally means "a minister," "one who performs services for another," and Paul speaks of the deacons ("ministers") of Satan and "ministers of Christ"³

Not given to much wine (iii. 8).—These Epistles oppose the intemperate use of wine, but not its use in moderation.⁴ The "brawler" is one who becomes noisy from drinking too much wine.

Holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience (iii. 9).—The expression, *the mystery of the faith*, is not elsewhere used, but "mystery of godliness" occurs in verse 16. To Paul the contents of the gospel of Christ is a mystery "kept in silence through times eternal."⁵ It is here the truth embodied in the faith of the believers, and not that contained in faith regarded as a system of doctrine. But why it should be called a *mystery* is not apparent, since the idea is not suggested by the connection as in Eph. i. 9, iii. 3; 1 Cor. ii. 7. The whole expression has the appearance of phrase-making without a definite conception or purpose.

And let these also first be proved (iii. 10).—How or by whom the persons to be chosen were to be *proved* is conjectural. Probably no more is meant than that those who were to choose them should make the necessary inquiries. Whether in the time to which these Epistles belong they were chosen by the churches as in the apostolic age is uncertain.

¹ 2 Tim. ii. 26.

² 2 Cor. xi. 15, 23.

³ Acts vi. 1-6.

⁴ 1 Tim. v. 23; Tit. ii. 3.

⁵ Rom. xvi. 25.

Women in like manner must be grave (iii. 11).—To what *women* reference is made is uncertain. To pass from deacons to women in general would be abrupt. Then wives of deacons are mentioned in the next verse. Perhaps the *women* in question were such as stood in semi-official relation to the churches.

Let deacons be husbands of one wife (iii. 12).—This is to be interpreted in the same way as the similar injunction regarding bishops (verse 2).

For they that have served well as deacons gain to themselves a good standing, etc. (iii. 13).—*For* is not clear, since the following words do not appear to be connected with the foregoing in such a relation as can be indicated by this conjunction.

Standing (iii. 13) has given rise to much discussion. The word means “step,” “grade of dignity,” “rank,” and its interpretation depends on the questions whether the rank or position in the writer’s mind was related to promotion in the Church or to a standing in the future life of the kingdom of God. The absence of any reference to the life to come and the succeeding words, *boldness in the faith*, which may well mean confidence in the midst of official duties, favour the former interpretation. The fact that the latter is unpauline in making the rewards of the life in the age to come dependent on works is not a reason for rejecting it as the teaching of the writer of this Epistle.

These things I write unto thee hoping to come unto thee shortly (iii. 14).—*These things* probably refers to the directions given in the foregoing section beginning with chapter ii. There is no known situation in which Paul could have written this Epistle with the hope of soon going to Timothy, and if he were entertaining such a hope there appears to be no reason why he should have written the letter at all. The author in assuming the part of the apostle has not well adapted his writing to all the circumstances. The interpretation

“ although hoping to come to thee shortly ” partially relieves the difficulty, but is of questionable correctness.

The house of God, which is the Church of the living God (iii. 15).—As God was supposed to dwell in the tabernacle or temple these were called His *house*.¹ So the Church being His people, is regarded as figuratively His abode or *house*. Accordingly, God is “ the master of the house,”² and the apostles are His stewards.³ In Eph. ii. 19, Christians are said to be “ of the household of God.” See 1 Cor. iii. 9, “ ye are God’s building.” The definite designation of the Church as *the house of God* indicates a post-apostolic time when the conception of its unity, which is apparent in Ephesians, was developed in the direction of compact organisation.

The pillar and ground of the truth (iii. 15).—This is the Church, not God. The truth is accordingly supported by the Church instead of the Church being supported by the truth. The advance here indicated beyond Paul in the direction of ecclesiasticism is apparent when we consider that for him Christ was the foundation.⁴ Even in Ephesians it is “ the apostles and prophets ” (ii. 20).

And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness (iii. 16).—The connection of this declaration with the preceding course of thought is not very evident. Probably the writer had in his mind a vague relation of “ truth ” (verse 15) to *the mystery of godliness*.

He who was manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels (iii. 16).—The reading according to which “ God ” was at the beginning of this passage instead of “ who ” is without adequate support. It is fruitless to search for an antecedent to “ who ” among the words that precede. No antecedent is expressed, and none is implied. The writer has simply employed a liturgical formula or a fragment of a

¹ Matt. xii. 4, xxi. 13.

² Matt. xiii. 27.

³ 1 Cor. iv. 1.

⁴ 1 Cor. iii. 11. See Hincks, *ut supra*, p. 109 f.

hymn familiar to him as part of the religious services of the Church. He appears to have brought it into some relation in his mind with "the mystery of godliness," but any such relation is far-fetched. The formula is doubtless intended as a shot at the false teachers who probably denied some of the propositions which it contains. The manifestation *in the flesh* opens the series of Christological declarations, and of course refers to the earthly appearance of Jesus. The same word (*manifested*) is employed in this sense in Heb. ix. 26; 1 Pet. i. 20; 1 John iii. 5, 8. In Col. iii. 4 it is used of the Parousia, or second manifestation of Christ at "the end of the age." The words *in the flesh* are doubtless employed with emphatic intention. Compare, "is come in the flesh," 1 John iv. 2; 2 John 7. If the emphasis be placed on *manifested* the writer may be understood to have expressed himself after the manner of the Docetic heretics, who maintained that the body of Christ was unreal, that is, only a manifestation. If *in the flesh* be emphasised, the words may be intended to oppose this false teaching. The expression evidently implies the doctrine of the preëxistence of Christ, since only one who had formerly existed without a body of flesh could be declared to have been *manifested in the flesh*.

Justified in the spirit (iii. 16).—The term *justified* is nowhere else in the New Testament applied to Christ, and the meaning is not that in which it is used by Paul in connection with faith, "justified through faith," etc. The sense is similar to Rom. i. 4, "declared to be the Son of God," that is, shown to be what he really was, not merely flesh, but Spirit. Perhaps the idea of his resurrection is involved, in accordance with the expression, "put to death in the flesh, quickened in the Spirit."¹

Seen of angels (iii. 16).—In being exalted to heaven Christ showed himself to the angels in accordance with a conception which finds manifold expression in the later Epistles.²

¹ 1 Pet. iii. 18.

² Eph. iii. 10; 1 Pet. i. 12, iii. 22.

Preached among the nations (iii. 16).—"Nations" is an expression for the peoples who are not Jews, though it is not intended here to exclude a proclamation to the latter.¹

Believed on in the world (iii. 16), that is, became an object of faith. *World* is used as in i. 15, vi. 7 without the bad sense of the evil world in which it is frequently employed.

Received up in glory (iii. 16).—The writer does not say "into glory," as if he conceived Jesus to have been "received up" into a state in which he was not already, unless we suppose him to have meant to say "received up into glory and abiding in glory"—an interpretation which has been suggested, and which is perhaps admissible.

As in 2 Tim. iii. 1 f. the writer now gives attention again to the false teachers resuming matters touched upon in i. 3, 4, 6, 7, 19, 20 (iv. 1-15).

But the Spirit saith expressly that in later times some shall fall away from the faith, etc. (iv. 1).—*The Spirit* designates the Holy Ghost regarded in the early Church as the prophetic principle. But where the express sayings of the Spirit are to be found is not indicated. *In later times*.—In the corresponding passage in 2 Tim. iii. 1, "the last days" is employed meaning the end of the pre-Messianic age, or the time immediately before the second coming of Christ in "his kingdom" (2 Tim. iv. 1). *Later times* is not precisely equivalent to this expression, but means a period subsequent to the apostolic age, in which age, personating Paul, he places himself, and speaks prophetically. By *some* or certain ones, who shall *fall away* are not meant the false teachers themselves, but those whom they should mislead. *Faith* is used in the sense of the accepted doctrine of the Church.

Giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils (iv. 1).—"Seducing spirits" means spirits of seduction without

¹ 1 Tim. iv. 2; 1 Cor. xv. 12; 2 Cor. i. 19; Phil. i. 15.

personification in opposition to "the spirit of truth."¹ *Doctrines of devils* does not denote doctrines concerning devils, but those that originate with devils, like "doctrines of men,"² and the wisdom that is devilish.³ Contemporary with the writer was the doctrine that false teachings, heathen wisdom, Gnosis, etc., were diffused upon the earth by fallen angels, how, except they were conceived to dwell in men, is not intelligible. Perhaps the writer thought of the *devils* as "possessing" the false teachers.

Through the hypocrisy of men that speak lies (iv. 2).—The connection of these words is very obscure, and they stand in an objectionably loose relation. They must be joined either with "fall away," or with "giving heed." *The men that speak lies* are false teachers.⁴

Branded in their own conscience as with a hot iron (iv. 2).—Slaves and criminals were "branded" on the forehead. So the false teachers are *branded in their conscience*. The figure is not well chosen. The brand of a criminal was an evidence of his guilt, but a branded conscience is not comparable to an exhibition of a mark of guilt to the world. The expression is not used elsewhere in the New Testament.

Forbidding to marry and commanding to abstain from meats (iv. 3).—Irenæus says of the Gnostics known as Saturninians that they taught that marriage and the propagation of children were of the devil. There can be little doubt that this passage and ii. 15 are directed against this heresy and kindred ones, perhaps including that of Marcion, or at least that of the Ophites.

For every creature of God is good, and nothing is to be rejected (iv. 4).—The word here rendered *creature*⁵ is not used by Paul. Included in it are evidently all animals suitable for food. The connection is against the supposition that the writer had anything else in mind, women, for example, the

¹ 1 John iv. 6.² Cor. ii. 22.³ Jas. iii. 15.⁴ 2 Pet. ii. 1.⁵ κτίσμα.

“weaker vessel” according to von Soden’s suggestion,¹ as if he were writing for men only.

Sanctified through the word of God and prayer (iv. 5).—Taken in connection with “thanksgiving” (verse 4), these words may be understood to refer to the prayerful expression of thanks. *The word of God* is in any case a term of obscure meaning as here employed.

But refuse profane and old wives’ fables (iv. 7).—This term does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament.² Compare 2 Tim. ii. 23. It is a characterisation of the teachings of the heretics or Gnostic speculators, who dealt in myths or fables, genealogies (i. 4), etc., respecting the so-called “æons.”

Exercise thyself unto godliness (iv. 7).—The word rendered *exercise* means to put forth any strenuous exertion. The end here is *godliness*, which is opposed by the writer to the occupations of the false teachers.

For bodily exercise is profitable for a little, but godliness is profitable for all things (iv. 8).—“Bodily exercise” is probably to be taken literally rather than as indicating the ascetic restraints of the false teachers or the gestures and ceremonies of a certain sort of piety. The connection of thought is loose, and it appears as if “exercise” in verse 7 suggested to the writer the gymnastic performances of the Greeks, and led him to throw in the remark to supply an antithesis to “godliness.” *For a little* is set over against *all things* in the following clause, and does not mean “for a little while” as the same Greek words do in Jas. iv. 14.

But godliness is profitable for all things, having the promise of the life that now is and of that which is to come (iv. 8).—This utilitarian maxim has many analogues in the New Testament ethics, in which a personal advantage to be realised in the attainment of salvation, or in other words, in the securing of the blessedness of the Messianic kingdom, is a prominent motive. *Godliness is profitable*, because it has the promise of

¹ 1 Pet. iii. 7.

² γρᾰώδης.

the present life, but in what respect is not indicated. Possibly a long life according to the Hebrew idea of the goods of this world is meant (see "the first commandment with a promise," Eph. vi. 2). Moreover, godliness has the promise of the life to come, an expression not elsewhere used in the New Testament, although "the age to come" is of frequent occurrence. The words refer to the Messianic age when the believers would, as was expected, enter upon the enjoyment of the "reign" of Christ. The *promise* of this blessedness belonged to the godly.

Faithful is the saying (iv. 9).—These words are intended to support the preceding declaration. The writer, unlike Paul, was not content to leave his propositions and arguments to carry what conviction they might, but prefixes or adds the assertion that his "sayings" are "faithful," etc.

For to this end we labour and strive, because we have our hope set on the living God (iv. 10).—The connection made by *for* is not very clear, and *to this end* is wanting in precision. Here as in some other instances the writer appears to have had a thought which he did not logically connect with the context. His style is not rich in particles, and when he uses them he shows himself deficient in skill. He was not a clear thinker.

Who is the Saviour of all men, specially of them that believe (iv. 10).—On God as Saviour see note on i. 1. This passage should be interpreted in the light of ii. 4 according to which God wishes the salvation of all men. The writer's thought doubtless was that God is potentially the Saviour of all men, is willing that all should be saved, while He really saves only those who comply with the conditions of salvation, that is, become believers. The salvation known to Paul and the writers of the post-Pauline Epistles was participation in the Messianic "reign" of Christ, which was to be inaugurated at his expected early coming. In the apostle's thought it was distinctly confined to believers, and this writer misses as usual

the precision of his great predecessor's expression when he says "*especially of them that believe.*" The strictly Pauline words would have been "*exclusively of them that believe.*" Yet Paul can hardly be imagined as saying that God is the Saviour of all men and adding this qualification respecting believers.

Let no man despise thy youth (iv. 12).—On the supposition of the Pauline authorship of the Epistle, Timothy could not have been so young as to justify this exhortation.¹

Give heed to reading, to exhortation, to teaching (iv. 13).—These are all offices of a public character in the religious assemblies for worship. The *reading* is that of the Scriptures, the Old Testament, in these assemblies.

Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery (iv. 14).—Which one of the several "gifts," which in the early Church were supposed to be communicated by the Spirit,² the writer had in mind is not apparent. Since the "gifts" were believed to be from the Holy Spirit, *by prophecy* may be understood as indicating the instrumentality of its bestowment. Some prophetic expression appears to have accompanied the laying on of the hands of *the presbytery*, a word which occurs here only, and denotes a post-apostolic organisation of the Church. A formal ceremony of ordination is implied in the passage. (See the Introduction.)

Be diligent in these things (iv. 15), that is, in the observance of the exhortations given in verses 12-14.

Pastoral directions respecting relations to old and young and respecting the widows of the Church, elders, and servants are given in v. 1-vi. 21. Schleiermacher calls this section the kernel of the whole Epistle, the most concrete and most intelligible part of it.

Rebuke not an elder (v. 1).—"Elder" is not here an officer of the Church, but simply a man of years. The Greek word is used to designate the official "elders" of the Jews and

¹ See Tit. ii. 15.

² 1 Cor. xii. 4-12. See Hincks, *ut supra*.

Christians and also forefathers, and is employed here only in the New Testament in this sense.

In all purity (v. 2) may grammatically relate to all the preceding members of the sentence, but was probably thought by the writer only in connection with the younger women, who should be treated as *sisters*.

Honour widows that are widows indeed (v. 3).—This subject is not treated elsewhere than in this section throughout the Pastoral Epistles. *Widows* are incidentally mentioned by Paul¹ and in Acts vi. 1, ix. 39-42. *Honour* is used in the usual sense and does not signify “give aid” as some have argued. *Widows indeed* were probably widows who had no relations on whom they could depend, and were accordingly in a position of peculiar lonesomeness and need, although why all widows should not be honoured is not apparent if they were deserving of honour for their character. Possibly “wives of one husband” are meant, widows who had never entered upon a second marriage.

But if any widow hath children let them first learn to show piety toward their own family (v. 4).—The writer has not made himself understood in so simple a matter as this. The most learned expositors ancient and modern do not agree as to what is the subject of *let them first learn*, some thinking it to be a pronoun representing *any widow*, regarded as a collective term, and others finding it in *children*, etc. If the former view be adopted, the widow is enjoined to *show piety* toward her children, etc., and if the latter, the children, etc., to take care of the widow. But on this latter hypothesis the plural *parents* is unnatural, since the relation of children and grandchildren toward a parent, the widow, is in question. Yet even in this case the writer might have thought of widows and not of one widow, and been led at the end of the sentence to use the plural. It is not certain, however, that the children in question were assumed to be

¹ 1 Cor. vii. 8.

old enough to take care of the mother. On the whole, the former interpretation of the two mentioned is preferable. *First*, that is, probably before they (the widows) occupy themselves with the affairs of the Church. *Requite their parents* means to do for their own children what their own parents have done for them.

Now she that is a widow indeed and desolate hath set her hope on God (v. 5).—*And desolate* is explanatory of *a widow indeed*, who is desolate because having no relations either to care for her or to be objects of her care. Such a one *sets her hope on God*, having no earthly object of hope, and perhaps having made a resolution not to marry again (verse 11).

In supplications and prayer night and day (v. 5).—See Luke ii. 37 ; Rom. xii. 12 ; Col. iv. 2 ; 1 Thess. ii. 9.

The portraiture of a widow here given bears some resemblance to that contained in Luke ii. 37, and perhaps denotes the influence of the Gospel-narrative upon the writer. The indications are, however, very few that he was familiar with the ideas or the phraseology of the Gospels. The designation of God as Saviour (1 Tim. i. 1, ii. 3, iv. 10 ; Tit. i. 3, ii. 10, iii. 4) occurs in the Gospels only in Luke i. 47, and is easily explained without reference to that passage. The employment of "that day" (2 Tim. i. 12, 18, iv. 8) for the time of the second coming of Christ (the Parousia more probably denotes the influence of Luke vi. 23, x. 12, xvii. 21, xxi. 34 (see also 2 Thess. i. 10). It is, however, somewhat hazardous to attribute, as von Soden does, "to save sinners" (1 Tim. i. 15) to a combination of "to call sinners" and "to save the lost" in Luke v. 32 and xix. 10. The same must be said of "labourer" (1 Tim. v. 18) with reference to Luke x. 2, 7.

But she that giveth herself to pleasure is dead while she liveth (v. 6).—A voluptuous, pleasure-seeking life is a life in death, an apparent and not a real life. The Greek verb, "to die,"¹ here used is not found elsewhere in the Epistles. "Death" in the ethical sense is rare in the New Testament

¹ θνήσκω.

(Matt. viii. 22), and it is doubtful whether it ever occurs in Paul, who generally understood by it bodily dissolution, which came as the consequence of sin, together with exclusion from the resurrection at the Parousia and from participation in the Messianic kingdom.

But if any provideth not for his own and especially his own household, he hath denied the faith (v. 8).—It is questionable whether this passage is to be taken in a general sense or to be interpreted in connection with the foregoing and following, that is, in relation to widows. It furnishes another example of the author's loose construction. It seems very improbable that even he should have inserted a general remark into the midst of the discussion of the duties of widows, and accordingly it is perhaps correct to relate the passage to verse 4 in the sense that those who are not "widows indeed" should not neglect their relations and dependents in order to attend to the affairs of those who are "widows indeed."

Let none be enrolled as a widow under threescore years old, having been the wife of one man (v. 9).—"Be enrolled." This verb is not elsewhere used in the New Testament, and means "to be put on a list." Here the list is that of the "widows indeed." It is not clearly indicated to what end the enrollment was to be made, but the list was probably one of widows who were to be supported by the Church. Whether they had stated duties to perform and constituted an official class is uncertain. It was a requirement that the woman should not be a widow of a second husband, just as a bishop must be "the husband of one wife" (iii. 2; Tit. i. 6).

Well reported of for good works; if she hath brought up children (v. 10).—The "good works" are mentioned in the successive clauses introduced by *if*, and all are requirements for enrollment on the list of "widows indeed." It is not stated, perhaps not implied, that the children *brought up*

must have been the widow's own. The conditions are in any case rather hard, and indicate, in the detail with which they are laid down, a time much later than the apostolic age.

But younger widows refuse, for when they have waxed wanton against Christ, they desire to marry, having condemnation, because they have rejected their first faith (v. 11, 12).—This injunction is not in opposition to that of verse 3, but requires the exclusion of *younger widows* from the enrollment (verse 9), which could include no widows under sixty. *Waxed wanton* includes desire only and not necessarily overt acts of lust. In contrast with this manifest condemnation of the marriage of widows see Paul's milder judgment.¹ Here the natural desire for marriage is declared to be *against Christ*, and a second marriage would exclude a widow from the support of the Church, however destitute and worthy she might be. The apostle says only that while widows are "free to be married" to whom they will, he thinks they will be "happier" unmarried. *Rejected their first faith* relates to an implied or expressed promise not to marry again on the part of widows as a condition of enrollment (verse 9). To *reject faith* is to break a promise.

I desire, therefore, that the younger widows marry (v. 14).—*Widows* does not stand in the original, and accordingly "the younger women" is an admissible translation. The writer can hardly have intended to say that he wished the *younger widows* to marry if the enrollment previously directed was with a view to the support of needy widows by the Church, since a second marriage would exclude a widow from the list in question. If the enrollment was with a view to the setting apart of a class of widows, "widows indeed," for certain functions in the Church, these functions must have been regarded as of importance, or the writer would not have given detailed instructions regarding them. But if his desire should be carried out, and all *younger widows* should marry,

¹ 1 Cor. vii. 39.

there would be no widows to perform them. To counsel all young widows to marry, then, was either to advise them to prejudice their fortunes and "reject their first faith" (verse 12), or to favour a procedure which must prejudice the welfare of the Church. If, then, the writer is to be regarded as consistent with himself, *younger widows* of the revised version should be "younger women" according to King James' version.

Give none occasion to the adversary for reviling (v. 14).—"The adversary" is probably the opponent of Christianity, a man hostile to the Church,¹ and not, as some think, the devil. The word here translated *adversary*² is not used in the New Testament to designate the devil.

For already some are turned aside after Satan (v. 15).—*Satan* occurs in only one other place in these Epistles (i. 20), where the writer, in imitation of Paul, says that he delivered certain persons unto Satan (see note on that passage). The meaning of this passage is doubtful. The writer may have had in mind a going astray from the true faith after the false teachers, or the pursuit of a life of sensuality.

If any woman that believeth hath widows (v. 16).—It is uncertain whether *hath widows* means has them as relations and dependents, or has them in her house for support, but probably the former, according to verse 4.

That it may relieve them that are widows indeed (v. 16).—These words support the opinion that the "widows indeed" were "enrolled" for support according to verse 9.

Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, etc. (v. 17).—"Elders" is used here in a different sense from that of "elder" in verse 5, and means members of the "presbytery" (iv. 14). The ancient commentators understood *honour* in the sense of *honorarium*, or pay for their services, and the citations in the next following verse support this interpretation. Still this verse might be sepa-

¹ 1 Cor. xvi. 9; 2 Thess. ii. 4.

² ἀντικείμενος.

rated from the following and *honour* understood as it evidently must be in vi. 1, had not the writer connected the two by "for." *In the word and in teaching*, discourse and instruction. A distinction is made between the presbyters who rule and the presbyters who teach, indicating a development of the organisation of the Church in the post-apostolic age.

For the Scripture saith (v. 18).—For a similar allegorical interpretation of this passage from the Old Testament see 1 Cor. ix. 9. The other citation is a saying of Jesus, but whether it was quoted as "Scripture" from Luke x. 7 or was a current "word of the Lord" known independently of the Gospel-record is uncertain. Moreover, if the words were quoted from Luke it is not certain that the writer regarded that Gospel as a part of sacred Scripture, for he may have intended the formula, "the Scripture saith," to relate only to the former citation. The saying was probably repeated by Jesus from the current proverbs, and was doubtless in use as such when the Epistle was written. Its use in immediate connection with a quotation from "Scripture" would be more significant than it is here in the hands of a precise writer. Yet there is no example in the New Testament of the quotation of "Scripture" and a proverb in immediate connection.

Except at the mouth of two or three witnesses (v. 19).—See Deut. xix. 15; 2 Cor. xiii. 1; Matt. xviii. 16.

And the elect angels (v. 21).—The meaning of this term is obscure. In Enoch xxxix. 1 *elect angels* are mentioned, but it is questionable whether those so designated were regarded as constituting a superior class, or whether they were thought to be simply "holy angels,"¹—a term which does not necessarily designate a class. But since election has reference to salvation when applied to Christians, and since some angels were supposed to have attained salvation

¹ Luke ix. 26.

or to have kept their first estate and others to have failed of it, it is not improbable that the former may have been designated here by the term *elect*.

Lay hands hastily on no man (v. 22).—The laying on of hands designates in these Epistles the induction into an office.¹ Probably the appointment of “elders” is intended on account of the connection, in which there is nothing to indicate the induction of catechumens or the reception of those who may have been expelled for heresy, although the reference to either of the two latter cases is not improbable. By laying hands on an unworthy man Timothy would be a *partaker* of his sins.

Some men's sins are evident going before unto judgment, etc. (v. 24).—The sins of some men are so notorious that the judgment which manifests all iniquity is not required to disclose them. *Going before* requires “them” for its more precise definition. The connection of this verse is with verse 22, but is broken by the inept insertion of verse 23. If this is the true connection, the *judgment* is such a test as Timothy might apply to candidates before the laying on of hands. The disconnected character of the section, verses 22-24, renders its interpretation difficult. The occurrence of “sins” in verse 22 may have suggested to the writer a general remark on notorious sins in verse 24 without any other connection of thought.

Be no longer a drinker of water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake (v. 23).—The recommendation must be understood so far as water is concerned to be against the exclusive drinking of it. As to wine, the moderate use of it is recommended.² The exclusive drinking of water and total abstinence from wine were directly in accord with the excessive [intemperate] asceticism of the false teachers, and rather advanced than opposed their principles. Accordingly the writer, one of whose chief contentions is against these

¹ 2 Tim. i. 6; 1 Tim. iv. 14.

² See iii. 8; Tit. ii. 3.

teachers, recommends a true temperance. The purpose to give a dietetic prescription, which appears in the form of the advice, belongs to the fiction of authorship.

Let as many as are servants under the yoke count their own masters worthy of all honour (vi. 1).—The directions here given regarding slaves are in the spirit and intention of those in Col. iii. 22-25; Eph. vi. 5-9; 1 Pet. ii. 18-25. *Yoke* is used here only in the New Testament of the yoke of slavery. It is employed in a metaphor of the Mosaic law in Gal. v. 1. *Their own masters* refers to the heathen masters of Christian slaves (see verse 2).

That the name of God and the doctrine be not blasphemed (vi. 1) is a curious connection of two objects of blasphemy. With greater precision it might have been said, "that the name of God be not blasphemed, and the doctrine not suffer reproach."

The slaves of *believing masters* (vi. 2) ought not to despise them, since they are brethren. Rather they should contentedly remain in service because they (the masters) who are benefited by it are *believing and beloved*. Here as in other places in the New Testament where the relations of slaves are touched upon, nothing is said of the evil and injustice of slavery, but the institution is recognised and regulated.

The writer now briefly addresses himself to the false teachers, abruptly breaking off from the foregoing and finally rambling, on the suggestion of the word "gain," into a discussion of riches and the love of money.

If any man teacheth a different doctrine (vi. 3).—See note on i. 3. *A different doctrine* is the heterodoxy of the false teachers who oppose the *sound words of the Lord Jesus Christ*.

Puffed up (vi. 4).—See iii. 6. Blinded by foolish pride, and not simply vain, is the idea conveyed by the word rendered *puffed up*. Though *knowing nothing and doting about questionings and disputes of words*, they assume to be capable

of teaching the sublime truths of religion. The word rendered *doting* means "having a morbid fondness for."

Supposing that godliness is a way of gain (vi. 5), that is, that their false piety, the "form of godliness" (2 Tim. iii. 6), will bring them *gain*, since they teach "for filthy lucre's sake."¹

The corruption of "mind" attributed to these men suggests a brief consideration of this term (*νοῦς*), as it is used in the psychology of Paul. The most comprehensive determination of it is found in Rom. vii. 23, where it represents "the inward man" in contrast with "the flesh" or the "law in the members." There "the law of the mind" is nothing less than the law of righteousness or the moral law. In this ethical capacity the "mind" may become "reprobate,"² "blinded," and "corrupted."³ Compare "vanity of mind,"⁴ "mind of the flesh" (Col. ii. 18), and defilement of "mind and conscience."⁵ It is in this ethical relation that the mind is regarded as capable of "renewal."⁶ In this state of renewal it is conceived as "the mind of Christ,"⁷ that is, as such a mind as was that of Christ in respect to its spiritual and moral attitude toward the divine law.⁸ The functions of knowledge, thought, and reason are among those most frequently ascribed to the *νοῦς*. By it the "invisible things of God" are "understood" from the things that are made.⁹ In 1 Cor. xiv. 14 it stands for the reflective thought which may be fruitful or "unfruitful." In Rom. vii. 18 ff. the "will" should probably be assigned to the *νοῦς*, since in verse 23 it is the "law of the mind," which stands opposed to the "law in the members." Thus *μετανοεῖν* denotes to change the direction of the will, to repent.

But godliness with contentment is great gain (vi. 6).—This is to be explained according to iv. 8, "godliness is profitable for all things."

The fact that we *brought nothing into the world and can carry nothing out of it* (vi. 7) is adduced as a reason why *godliness with contentment is great gain*. But really what

¹ Tit. i. 11.⁴ Eph. iv. 17.⁷ 1 Cor. ii. 16.² Rom. i. 28.⁵ Tit. i. 15.⁸ See Eph. iv. 23.³ 2 Cor. iii. 14, xi. 3.⁶ Rom. xii. 2.⁹ Rom. i. 20.

the writer appears to have intended was to give a reason why men should be contented with meagre possessions, *food and covering* being sufficient. *Such as drown men in destruction and perdition* (vi. 9), that is, effect their exclusion from the Messianic kingdom.¹ "How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God" (Mark x. 23). See also Phil. i. 28, where *perdition* is opposed to "salvation."

For the love of money is a root of all kinds of evil ; which some reaching after, etc. (vi. 10).—This is an extravagant statement, since there are manifestly very many kinds of evil with which *the love of money* has no connection, of which it cannot be called *the root*. The relation that introduces the second clause makes an inaccurate connection, since in the original it must be joined with the word translated *the love of money*. "The love of money which some reaching after," etc., makes an incongruous expression.

But thou, O man of God, flee these things (vi. 11).—These things could only inaccurately be related to the love of money, and should probably be referred to the whole contents of verses 3-10, the false teachings as well as avarice. A group of noble virtues follows, *righteousness, godliness*, etc.

Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on the life eternal (vi. 12).—See 1 Cor. ix. 24-26 ; 1 Thess. ii. 2 ; Heb. xii. 1 ; 2 Tim. iv. 7. *The fight of faith* is the life-contest in which all must engage who would be true to the Christian belief. *The life eternal* is the blessedness of the Messianic kingdom, to which believers are said to be *called* or *chosen*, since they are "the elect."² This eternal life is conceived as the award of the conflict, the prize, and accordingly the criticism is fair which regards the injunction to *lay hold on* it as incongruous, since it must be a gift of God. *Among many witnesses*, probably at the ordination by the presbytery (iv. 14).

I charge thee in the sight of God who quickeneth all things (vi. 13).—See Rom. xi. 36 ; 1 Cor. viii. 6 ; Heb. i. 3. The

¹ 1 Thess. v. 3.

² Rom. viii. 23 ; Col. iii. 12 ; 2 Tim. ii. 10.

injunction to "keep the commandment" hardly appears to be introduced by all this solemn formula of a liturgical character with a right sense of literary congruity and proportion.

Until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ (vi. 14).—Paul does not use the word here translated *appearing* (ἐπιφάνειν) for the second coming of Christ, unless the doubtful authorship of 2 Thessalonians be ascribed to him. It appears in that Epistle once (ii. 8), but Paul employs in his undisputed Epistles, "revelation" and "parousia." Apart from the Pastoral Epistles¹ it occurs only in 2 Thess. ii. 8. The injunction to Timothy to keep the commandment *until the appearing* implies that the writer looked for this event within a comparatively short time in accordance with the general belief of the age.

Which in its own times He shall show (vi. 15).—See ii. 6; Tit. i. 3. The manifestation of the kingdom of the Messiah was conceived to be effected by God Himself, and the grandeur of the theme moves the writer to break forth in a doxology probably adopted from the liturgical service of the Church of the time.

Who only hath immortality (vi. 16), that is, who alone has it in Himself, unimparted. The word rendered *immortality* is in 1 Cor. xv. 53 used as synonymous with "incorruption," which was supposed to be a quality of the spiritual bodies which the believers would assume at the Parousia. This incorruption was not thought to belong to man by nature, but to be the gift of God on account of faith in Christ, through whose death it was procured for as many as should believe. The idea that God dwells in light is not elsewhere found in the New Testament.

Connecting with verse 9 or 10 the writer again addresses himself to the rich, and tells Timothy to charge them not to be high-minded and not to set their hope on riches, but on

¹ 2 Tim. i. 10, iv. 1, 8; Tit. ii. 13.

God, from whom all things that we enjoy proceed, and that they make a benevolent use of their wealth.

Laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come (vi. 17, 18, 19).—This charge to admonish the rich not to be high-minded, etc., indicates the late date of the Epistle, since the earliest churches were in all probability composed of humble people. The conditions here presupposed have a place only in a church that has enjoyed years of prosperity, during which some fortunes have been accumulated. There is an incongruity in the idea of storing up a foundation, and the words present a grammatical difficulty which has been resolved by construing *foundation* as in apposition with the noun implied in the participle rendered *laying up in store*. The author's idea evidently is that the rich be taught that a spiritual advantage, "gain," might be secured by a benevolent use of their wealth, and as *the life which is life indeed* (vi. 19) doubtless means the "eternal life" of the Messianic kingdom, the teaching appears to be that through benevolence the rich might be saved. This is not only undisguised utilitarianism, but also a doctrine directly antagonistic to Paul's salvation by faith, "not by works."

In concluding the Epistle the writer again takes up the main theme, that of heresy, in warning Timothy to turn *away from the profane babblings and oppositions of knowledge, which is falsely so called* (vi. 20).—*Profane babblings* is a good example of the expression of the *odium theologicum*. In this style of argument the writer has had many imitators. In designating the false teaching as a *Gnosis* ("knowledge") falsely so called, he with apparent intention names the opponents whom he has been combating as Gnostics.

Which some professing have used concerning the faith (vi. 21).—*Some* designates the false teachers (i. 3) and perhaps their followers (i. 6; 2 Tim. ii. 18).

THE SECOND EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

EXPOSITION.

The Epistle opens with a greeting after which follow exhortations to Timothy to the interruption at i. 15 (i. 1-18).

The greeting in this Epistle differs from that of the other two Pastoral Epistles in connecting, in imitation of Paul, *apostle* with *by the will of God*, and in joining also to that title the unpauline expression, *according to the promise of the life which is in Jesus Christ* (i. 1).—In 1 Tim. i. 1 we have “according to the commandment of God,” and in Tit. i. 1 “according to the faith of God’s elect.” *According to the promise* probably indicates here the object of the apostleship, that is, the preaching of *the promise*, etc. On *the life which is in Jesus Christ*, see Rom. v. 17, vi. 2-14, xiv. 7-12; Gal. ii. 19, 20; Phil. i. 21, ii. 16; Col. iii. 4; John i. 4, xi. 25, xiv. 6; 1 John iv. 9, and “the life which is life indeed.”¹ If the term is not limited to the life of “the age to come,” it doubtless includes this Messianic blessedness.²

I thank God *how unceasing is my remembrance of thee* (i. 3).—The sentence is not clear on account of the introduction of the subordinate clause by *how*, where “that”

¹ 1 Tim. vi. 19.

² See 1 John ii. 25.

would be more natural. But the idea is that the writer's thanks to God relate to Timothy.

That I may be filled with joy (i. 4) is connected with *desiring to see thee*.

Having been reminded (i. 5) does not necessarily imply an external occasion.

Which dwelt first in thy grandmother Lois and thy mother Eunice (i. v).—This language seems appropriate only if addressed to a boy or a very young man and uncalled for in any case. The opinion that the writer thought of Timothy as a young man appears to be well founded.' These names do not appear elsewhere. In Acts xvi. 1 the mother of Timothy is called "a Jewess who believed," and since neither of the names is Jewish, the conjecture is probable that, unless this whole matter of Timothy's grandmother and mother is fictitious, Lois was a Jewish proselyte, so that both were Jewesses only in belief. The "faith" of Lois, then, was not that of a Christian woman.

And I am persuaded in thee also (i. 5).—This is surprising after the mention of Timothy's *unfeigned faith*, and is superfluous unless intended to express doubt.

For which cause I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God (i. 6).—"For which cause" is a latinism, and is not used by Paul. The connection of the phrase is doubtful. If it be related to "unfeigned faith" or to "I am persuaded," it hardly seems appropriate, because the exhortation which follows it implies a want of spiritual life. Yet there appears to be nothing else to which it can be related. The exhortation which it introduces is appropriate if we suppose "I am persuaded," etc., to imply a doubt in the writer's mind of Timothy's faith. *The gift*, or charism, as known to Paul was regarded as communicated by the Holy Spirit, and he never speaks of its communication by *the laying on of hands*. Here there is no reference to the ordination by the

“presbytery,”¹ on which occasion another “gift” was, it appears, bestowed. We are not informed as to the nature of either of them. The “gift,” whatever it may have been, was not conceived as independent in its operation and effectiveness of the nature of its recipient, since in Timothy it is here assumed to have become inactive, and he is supposed to be able to stir it up.

For God gave us not a spirit of fearfulness (i. 7).—This appears to have been suggested by Rom. viii. 15. See “spirit of the world”² and “spirit of stupor.”³ *Spirit of fearfulness* does not elsewhere occur in the New Testament. *Discipline* may mean self-control or the power of controlling others.

Be not ashamed, therefore, of the testimony of our Lord (i. 8).—“For I am not ashamed of the gospel.”⁴ The meaning is testimony in respect to Christ, perhaps, “the works of an evangelist” (iv. 5).

Who saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works (i. 9).—God instead of Christ is represented as saving the believers, for whom *us* stands.⁵ *Called us.*⁶ The calling was through the preaching of the gospel. Paul never connects *holy* with it. *Not according to our works*, is from the Pauline point of view, as is the expression, *His own purpose and grace.*⁷ The *called* are such as are included in the *purpose* of God.⁸ *Which was given*, etc., refers to *grace*. *In times eternal*; it was of course given only in the purpose of God.

Who abolished death (i. 10), that is, rendered death ineffective, broke its power. Paul uses the same word: “The last enemy that shall be abolished is death.”⁹ The writer

¹ 1 Tim. iv. 14. ² 1 Cor. ii. 12. ³ Rom. xi. 8. ⁴ *Ibid.* i. 16.

⁵ See 1 Tim. i. 1, ii. 3, iv. 10; Tit. i. 3.

⁶ Eph. iv. 1, 4; Heb. iii. 1; 1 Cor. vii. 20.

⁷ Eph. ii. 9; Jas. ii. 14-26; Rom. iii. 27, iv. 2, ix. 11.

⁸ Rom. viii. 28; Eph. i. 11.

⁹ 1 Cor. xv. 26.

does not mean, as Paul does not, that physical death was at once to come to an end. This would end only when the Christ should come again to set up his kingdom. Then the believers would be clothed upon with incorruptible spiritual bodies, and in that kingdom there would be no more death. But "death" is also used in the sense of "perishing," that is, of exclusion from the resurrection and the Messianic kingdom. This sort of death Christ *abolished* for all who believe.¹

The life and incorruption brought to light (i. 10) by Jesus are those of this kingdom so earnestly expected soon to come, in which "this corruptible shall have put on incorruption."² *Through the gospel* this Messianic salvation was made known and made possible (Rom. i. 16). This entire conception is in accordance with the Pauline "gospel."³

An apostle and a teacher (i. 11).—Paul never calls himself a *teacher*. *For the which cause* (i. 12), that is, since I am an apostle. *These things* (see verse 8).

To guard that which I have committed unto him against that day (i. 12).—This passage is capable of two grammatical renderings according as "the deposit of me" or "my deposit" (*παράθηκην μου*) is understood as a deposit made by, or to, me. According to verse 14 and 1 Tim. vi. 20, the latter is the probable meaning, and the translation should be *that which has been committed unto me*, probably his ministry. God in whom he has believed will, he thinks, guard this, that is, through His aid he himself will be able to guard it, against the day of the coming of Christ, when he will render an account of it.⁴ In these three passages only does "the day" of the Parousia have "that" connected with it. Paul says "the day,"⁵ and "the day of the Lord."⁶

¹ 1 Thess. iv. 14-18; 1 Cor. xv. 51-55.

² 1 Cor. xv. 54.

³ Rom. ii. 16.

⁴ i. 18, iv. 8; 2 Thess. i. 10.

⁵ Rom. xiii. 12; 1 Cor. iii. 13; 1 Thess. v. 4.

⁶ 1 Cor. i. 8; 2 Cor. i. 14; 1 Thess. v. 2. See also Rom. ii. 5, 16, and "day of redemption," Eph. iv. 30.

*That good thing which was committed unto thee (i. 14).—*This is the office of a minister (verse 12). *Through the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us.* The indwelling "Spirit" was regarded as the principle of the religious life.

*All that are in Asia (i. 15).—*This exaggeration marks the section (vv. 15-18) as spurious, or rather is an indication of the spuriousness of the Epistle, notwithstanding some traits of genuine personal references which appear in it. Paul could not so have expressed himself regarding the many true followers of his in Asia. The persons mentioned by name are otherwise unknown.

*In that day (i. 18).—*See note on verse 12.

The writer now resumes, after the interruption (i. 15-18), his exhortations to Timothy (ii. 1-13).

*Be strengthened in the grace that is in Christ Jesus (ii. 1).—*The grace abides in Christ, but is conceived as a source of strength to believers.¹

*Among many witnesses (ii. 2).—*A reference perhaps to Timothy's ordination or baptism.²

*Suffer hardship with me (ii. 3).—*See i. 8, 12, 16.—Figures drawn from military service and the games are loosely connected in vv. 4 and 5 relating to *entanglement in the affairs of this life* and to *contending lawfully*. By the latter term is perhaps meant contending with an eye single to the contest and hence without attention to other things.

The disconnected style of the writer is illustrated again in the remark on the compensation of the minister (ii. 6), to which subject he flies off without apparent occasion in the connection.³ The following is without logical relation to what precedes (vv. 7-9).

*For the Lord shall give thee understanding, etc. (ii. 7).—*For does not here give a reason for the preceding, but has the sense of "and truly" or "truly."

¹ 2 Cor. xii. 9.

² 1 Tim. iv. 14, vi. 12.

³ See 1 Tim. v. 18.

Remember Jesus Christ, of the seed of David, etc. (ii. 8).—These words should probably be related to verse 3. The remembrance of Jesus' sufferings would strengthen Timothy to endure "hardship." But why the series of prominent events from the birth of Jesus to his resurrection should have been added is inexplicable except on the assumption that the writer allowed his pen to wander off into the transcribing of a portion of the formula of a confession of faith used in public worship.

But the word of God is not bound (ii. 9).—Men may bind the preacher with chains, but *the word* goes forth, and it is not in their power to check its course.¹

Therefore I endure all things for the elect's sake, etc. (ii. 10).—See note on i. 9. *The elect* probably includes those already believing and as many as should become believers prior to the Parousia, "the day of the Lord," on which they would *obtain salvation* with the *eternal glory* of the Messianic kingdom, that is, their *salvation* would then be consummated.

Faithful is the saying (ii. 11).—This expression is peculiar to the Pastoral Epistles, and is a stylistic mark.²

For if we died with him (ii. 11).—The source of this *saying* (vv. 11-13) is uncertain. The supposition that it was taken from an ancient Christian hymn is not improbable. The words in Rom. vi. 8 and viii. 17 appear to lie at the basis of the first two clauses, although Paul in the former passage speaks of death in the sense of dying to "the old man," the symbol of which was baptism: "We were buried therefore with him through baptism into death."³ But the connection here requires us to interpret *died with him* in the sense of death by martyrdom.

We shall also reign with him (ii. 12).—As in Rom. viii. 17 the reference here is to the *reign* of Christ in the Messianic kingdom.

¹ 2 Thess. iii. 1.

² 1 Tim. i. 15, iii. 1, iv. 9; Tit. iii. 8.

³ Rom. vi. 4.

Faithless (ii. 13) does not mean "unbelieving," but "wanting in fidelity."¹

From ii. 14-iv. 22 the writer occupies himself chiefly with directions for the conduct of Timothy with reference to certain false teachers, and continues his exhortations.

Of these things put them in remembrance (ii. 14).—*These things* probably refers to vv. 11-13, though possibly including more. *Them* has no antecedent, but probably represents either the members of the Church or those who are to become teachers. *Strive not about words*. See 1 Tim. vi. 4. *To the subverting of them that hear*. See 2 Cor. x. 8.

To present thyself approved unto God (ii. 15).—See Rom. vi. 13, 16. *Handling aright the word of truth*. The rendering "rightly dividing" is nearer to the sense of the Greek word according to its composition.² The idea is, to teach the truth correctly. The word is not elsewhere used in the New Testament.

But shun profane babblings, for they will proceed (ii. 16).—See 1 Tim. vi. 20. The subject of *will proceed* (they) is supplied, and refers to those who occupy themselves with *profane babblings*. The construction is faulty.

And their word will eat as doth a gangrene (ii. 17), that is, will spread to the sound parts of the body. Two of these false teachers are now mentioned by name. *Of whom is* [are] *Hymenæus and Philetus*. Nothing more is known of these men (see 1 Tim. i. 20).

Who concerning the truth have erred saying that the resurrection is past already (ii. 18).—Any more definite characterisation of this so-called heresy is wanting in the Epistle. The "forbidding to marry"³ may throw some light on it, since if "the age to come" had already dawned, men ought to live in accordance with the conditions of that life in which there would be no marriage.⁴ This is not the same denial

¹ Rom. iii. 13. ² ὀρθοτομέω. ³ 1 Tim. iv. 3. ⁴ Luke xx. 35.

of the resurrection as that combated by Paul,¹ for his opponents averred that there was no resurrection at all. Perhaps in the second century the long delay of the Parousia had led some to maintain that it had already come ; and since with it the resurrection was expected, this contention would carry with it the doctrine that the dead had already been raised in the only sense in which they ever would be raised. Perhaps it was asserted that the resurrection was *past* in the sense that there is only a spiritual resurrection. This view would accord with Tertullian's charge that the Gnostics " distorted the resurrection of the dead into an imaginary one."

Howbeit, the firm foundation of God standeth, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are His ; and, Let every one that nameth the name of the Lord depart from unrighteousness (ii. 19).—The faith of some may be overthrown, but *the firm foundation of God standeth*. *Seal* is probably " inscription." The first (*foundation*) is based on Numb. xvi. 5, and the second (*seal*) perhaps on Isa. lii. 11. With an apparently abrupt transition the writer now proceeds to speak of the different kinds of persons in the Church under the figure of the different sorts of vessels *in a great house (ii. 20)*.

If a man purge himself from these (ii. 21).—*These* is of doubtful reference. If it be referred to *vessels of dishonour* violence is done to the figure by introducing *a man* among the two kinds of vessels. Either the writer confused the figure in his own mind—a not improbable supposition according to our knowledge of his thinking—or *these* relates to the persons mentioned in verse 18.

But flee youthful lusts, etc. (ii. 22).—See iii. 6; Tit. ii. 12, iii. 3. On the supposition of Paul's authorship of the Epistle Timothy was a man of mature years to whom such an admonition would be an impertinence. But, as we have seen, the writer thought of Timothy as a young man.² The rela-

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 12.

² 1 Tim. iv. 12. Professor Hincks finds that the manner in which

tion of this verse to the preceding thought is obscure. "*But flee,*" etc., and "*but foolish and ignorant questionings avoid,*" constitute a random collocation of phrases. Verse 23 is an abrupt return to the matter of false teachings.¹

But the Lord's servant must not strive (ii. 24).—*Strive*, probably, in the bad sense; yet he must be "a good soldier" (verse 3).

Repentance (ii. 25), that is, turning away from the opinions mentioned in verses 16-18.

And they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil (ii. 26).—*Recover themselves*. The Greek word means "to return to soberness." *To return to soberness out of a snare* is, however, a figure of doubtful elegance. *The devil*, the author of all evil, is chargeable, of course, with ensnaring (intoxicating?) the false teachers. Paul never uses the word, but always "Satan."

Having been taken captive by the Lord's servant unto the will of God.—There is nothing in the original that corresponds to these words! The Greek reads: "Out of the snare of the devil [they] having been taken captive unto the will of that one."

But know this that in the last days grievous times shall come (iii. 1).—*The last days* designates the time immediately preceding the second coming of Christ, "the end of the age" [world]. The expression, which Paul does not use at all, occurs here only in the Pastoral Epistles (see Jas. v. 3). For similar expressions see 1 Pet. i. 5, 20; 2 Pet. iii. 3; Jude 18.

For men shall be lovers of themselves (iii. 2-4).—This does not mean "there shall be men," but "men in general shall be." It has been remarked that the first five epithets describe men who have regard to themselves only and not to Timothy is addressed in the two Epistles does not comport with Paul's character, p. 99.

¹ 1 Tim. i. 4, vi. 4; Tit. iii. 9.

their fellow-men, and that qualities follow which rest upon a suppression of moral feeling, and are accordingly unnatural.

Holding a form of godliness, but having denied the power thereof (iii. 5).—The outward appearance of godliness (the word is not used by Paul), practising, perhaps, the conventional Christian morals. It has been conjectured that the description fits ascetic false teachers, who were in fact “lovers of pleasure,” but who maintained that the precepts about abstinence from marriage and certain foods did not concern them as “pneumatics,” but rather that all things were allowed to them as inaccessible to contamination on the principle that “to the pure all things are pure.”¹ In describing these persons, among whom the false teachers are included, the author shows his usual extravagance in accumulating apparently all the epithets known to his vocabulary applicable to bad men, thereby rather weakening than strengthening his case.

Creep into houses and take captive silly women, etc. (iii. 6).—The word rendered *silly women* is a diminutive of “woman,” and is a term of contempt, “little women,” “weak women,”² etc. It is not elsewhere used in the New Testament. One cannot but ask whether here is not another case of exaggeration, that is, whether all the women who accepted the teachings of the Gnostics were of the character here indicated. The *odium theologicum* of the writer must be taken into account in this entire connection.

And like as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses (iii. 8).—See Ex. vii. 11, 22. The sorcerers are not named in the account in Exodus, and where the writer found these names is unknown. The characterisation, *reprobate concerning the faith*, indicates that he had the false teachers in mind.

But they shall proceed no further (iii. 9).—The writer prophesies that the false teachers will be checked in their career, though they may “proceed further in ungodliness”

¹ Tit. i. 15.

² γυναῖκες.

(ii. 16), for men will see their *folly*, as that of the sorcerers *became evident*.

But thou didst follow my teaching, etc. (iii. 10).—In contrast with the false teachers was the conduct of Timothy.¹ *Follow*, in the sense of act in accordance with. The writer's fondness for accumulating words is illustrated here in the enumeration of particulars without regard to their appropriateness to the word *follow*, of which they are all the object.

What things befell me at Antioch, at Iconium, at Lystra (iii. 11).—See Acts xiii. 50, xiv. 1-5, 19-21. What determined the choice of these particular localities, which are not elsewhere mentioned in the Epistles, is a matter of conjecture. Timothy was not with Paul at these places, and it is not apparent in what sense he could have "followed" these events. It would have been more natural to select incidents in which he had had part. The probability is that these names were taken at random from the writer's recollection of the history in Acts. *The Lord delivered me*, that is, Christ delivered me. Paul ascribes his deliverance from perils in Asia to God.²

Yea, and all that would live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution (iii. 12).—This sentence is without apparent connection with the foregoing or the following. It indicates that the Epistle was written at a time when persecution actual or impending was general, or when a general persecution in the not remote past was looked back upon.

But evil men and impostors (iii. 13).—In contrast with the "godly," *evil men*, etc., will degenerate. *Impostors*. The Greek word primarily means "jugglers," and probably the writer had in mind men who practised secret arts and magic formulas in so-called exorcism. The false teachers are doubtless included in the term.

But abide thou in the things which thou hast learned (iii. 14).

¹ 1 Tim. iv. 6.

² 2 Cor. i. 8-10.

See 1 Tim. ii. 15 ; John viii. 31. *Of whom*.—The plural is the approved reading, and Timothy's mother and grandmother (i. 5) are probably intended.

And that from a babe thou hast known the sacred writings (iii. 15).—The Old Testament was doubtless in the writer's mind, although he appears to have quoted Luke as Scripture. *From a babe* (βρέφος) is inaccurate, for the word denotes an unborn fœtus or a newly born infant. The *sacred writings* of the Old Testament would be able to make one *wise unto salvation* only on condition of *faith in Christ Jesus*.

Every Scripture inspired of God (iii. 16).—The original reads, "Every Scripture inspired of God and [or also] useful." The question on which the interpretation depends is whether *inspired* and *useful* are both predicates or the former is an attribute. If *inspired* belongs to the predicate, "is" must be inserted before; if not, the copula must stand after *and*, as, "is also useful." This latter view of the matter makes the author say, "Every Scripture that is inspired of God is not only inspired of God, but is also useful." The most natural rendering is to regard both adjectives as attributes, and read "Every Scripture is inspired of God and useful," etc. *Scripture* in the language of the time stood as a technical term for the whole Old Testament canon, that is, for all that is "written," and there is no reason for dividing this term so that a discrimination shall be thrust in to the effect that a part of it is inspired and a part not. There is no example of such a discrimination in the literature of the New Testament, and no reason exists for supposing that this writer departed from the general opinion of his time regarding the inspiration of *every Scripture*. But whether he did or not is a matter of no great doctrinal importance, since the passage gives only the judgment of an unknown writer of the second century.

I charge thee in the sight of God and of Christ Jesus, who shall judge the quick and the dead, etc. (iv. 1).—The judg-

ment, conceived as future, is that which was looked for at the second coming of Christ. Here the judge is conceived to be Christ, as in John v. 22, 27, and Acts x. 42. Paul, however, ascribes the judgment to God alone or "by Jesus Christ."¹ The judgment at the Parousia would, it was believed, be pronounced upon the living (*quick*) and the risen *dead*, though it is not clear that Paul believed in the resurrection of unbelievers. *His appearing*, that is, the "revelation," as Paul called it, at the Parousia. *His kingdom* is the Messianic, to be set up at the Parousia.

Preach the word (iv. 2).—Paul speaks of preaching "the gospel" and "the word of faith,"² but not *the word* simply.

Be instant in season, out of season (iv. 2).—The Greek word means "be at hand." In 1 Thess. v. 3, it is rendered "cometh upon," of destruction upon the unbelievers.³ Here it means "be at hand" wherever occasion is for ministration. *In season, out of season*, probably means, "welcome or not." *Longsuffering and teaching* is a collocation of ideas which to most readers must appear strange and unexpected.

For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine (iv. 3).—*Sound*, that is, literally in good health. A sound doctrine is one that is pure, uncorrupted, and hence opposed to the false teaching. The expression occurs only in these Epistles.⁴ *Will heap to themselves teachers*, etc. This verb is found here only in the New Testament. The figure is anything but well chosen. *Having itching ears*. Compare "to tell or hear some new thing."⁵

Unto fables (iv. 4).—See 1 Tim. i. 4, iv. 7; Tit. i. 14; 1 Pet. i. 16.

But be thou sober (iv. 5), that is, deliberate, well-poised, or, in Calvin's words, having "spiritual sobriety."

¹ Rom. ii. 15, 16.

² Gal. ii. 2; 1 Thess. ii. 9; Rom. x. 8.

³ ἐφίεργμι.

⁴ 1 Tim. i. 10; Tit. i. 9, ii. 11.

⁵ Acts xvii. 21.

Do the work of an evangelist (iv. 5).—This word occurs besides only in Acts xxi. 8, and Eph. iv. 11. Its meaning is somewhat obscure. Philip was so called, and in Acts vi. 1-5 he appears as one of the seven men appointed to look after the widows of the Hellenists. According to Acts viii. 5, 26, he was occupied with "proclaiming the Christ," and converted and baptised an Ethiopian. Theodoret regarded *evangelists* as men who "went about preaching," and Eusebius speaks of them as those who were occupied with the tradition or "handing down of the holy Gospels," while Chrysostom thinks they were the authors of Gospels. Probably their office was not definitely determined, and only so much seems certain,—that they were helpers of the apostles in a subordinate capacity.

For I am already being offered, and the time of my departure is come (iv. 6).—*Being offered* is literally "poured out as a libation." The word is used besides only in Phil. ii. 17. The writer represents the apostle as pouring out his blood "like the wine of sacrifice on the altar of God." *I have fought the good fight (iv. 7)*, that is, the appointed conflict of life.¹ *I have finished the course.*² *I have kept the faith*, that is, the true Christian faith in opposition to all false doctrines.

Henceforth there is laid up for me the crown of righteousness, etc. (iv. 8).—Instead of *henceforth*, the rendering "at last," or "besides," or "already" is more fitting. *The crown of righteousness* is a crown which would denote the righteousness of his life. See 1 Cor. ix. 25. *In that day.* See note on i. 12.

To all them that have loved his appearing (iv. 8).—Since *appearing* is used in i. 10 for the historical manifestation of Christ and elsewhere in these Epistles for his Parousia or second coming, the reference here is doubtful. The perfect tense, *have loved*, favours the former interpretation, and the

¹ 1 Tim. vi. 12; 1 Thess. ii. 2; Phil. i. 30.

² Rom. ix. 16; 1 Cor. ix. 24; Gal. ii. 2, v. 7.

connection the latter. It should probably be interpreted as in verse 1, the perfect being regarded as expressing a relation to an expectation long cherished which one may say one has loved, or dwelt fondly upon.

Do thy diligence to come shortly unto me (iv. 9).—On the supposition of the genuineness of the Epistle, it is strange that, in view of all the perils from false teachers, Ephesus could be abandoned by Timothy for the sake of a personal visit to the apostle in prison. Moreover, if Timothy was to come *shortly*, what need of the letter containing instructions which could much better have been given orally?

*Demas forsook me, having loved this present world (iv. 10).*¹—This present world or age is contrasted with “the age to come,” or that of the Messianic kingdom. *Useful to me for ministering (iv. 11).*—Whether ministering of the gospel or by personal service be meant, this request does not well accord with verse 6. The request that Timothy come “shortly” is also hardly reconcilable with the writer’s being at the point of death, in view of the means of transportation available at that time and the distance of Ephesus from Rome. The fiction of authorship is not well carried out here.

The cloak that I left at Troas and the books (iv. 13).—The word translated *cloak* is of doubtful orthography and doubtful meaning, and is not elsewhere used in the New Testament. It is strange that the apostle who in verse 6 is represented as at the point of death should be represented as asking for a *cloak* and *books* which at the best could not be brought to him for some months.

Alexander the coppersmith (iv. 14).—An *Alexander* is mentioned in 1 Tim. i. 20, as a false teacher whom the apostle is represented as having “delivered unto Satan,” that he “might be taught not to blaspheme.” Whether the same person was in the writer’s mind here or not is uncertain.

¹ Col. iv. 14; Philem. 24.

He is confident that the man will receive his deserts, for *the Lord* will punish him, that is, probably, Christ as judge and avenger again.

At my first defence, etc. (iv. 16).—This implies that a second judicial hearing had been accorded. The desertion of those who should have supported him seems not to have stirred the apostle, whom the writer personates, as did the conduct of Alexander, and a more Christian note is struck in the words, *may it not be laid to their account.*¹ *But the Lord stood by me, etc. (iv. 17).* *The Lord* probably denotes Christ. The proclamation of *the message* probably refers to the knowledge of his courage and fidelity which would be spread abroad. Deliverance *out of the mouth of the lion* is a figure for escape from peril, perhaps here simply the postponement of the judicial decision.

The Lord will deliver me from every evil work, and will save me unto his heavenly kingdom (iv. 18).—The meaning of *every evil work* is doubtful. If the words refer to the evil that was contemplated in his further trial and death as a martyr, they are in direct opposition to verse 6. "Any evil deed which he might commit" is not a permissible interpretation, for the Greek word rendered *deliver* is not appropriate to this sense. Perhaps the meaning is that he would be delivered from the evils which threatened him from his adversaries in the sense that though he might be overcome and put to death, no prejudice would be done to his character as a Christian, to his steadfastness and fidelity, and that he would accordingly be saved in *the heavenly kingdom*, that is, the Messianic kingdom of the Parousia.

The expression, *heavenly kingdom (iv. 18)* does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament. But "the kingdom of God" relates to the future Messianic kingdom, as here, in 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10, xv. 50. It is called "the kingdom of Christ and God" in Eph. v. 5.² His kingdom is Christ's, for whom

¹ Luke xxiii. 34.

² See 2 Pet. i. 11.

Lord stands. The doxology, *to whom be glory*, etc., is addressed to Christ contrary to Paul's usage.

Prisca and Aquila (iv. 19), see Acts xviii. 2, 3, 26, were in Ephesus when 1 Corinthians was written,¹ as well as probably when Romans xvi. was written.

Eubulus, Rudens, Linus, and Claudice (iv. 21) are not elsewhere mentioned.

With thy spirit (iv. 22).—See Gal. vi. 18 ; Philemon, 25 ; 1 Tim. vi. 22.

¹ 1 Cor. xvi. 19.

THE EPISTLE TO TITUS.

EXPOSITION.

The long and involved introduction is somewhat after the style of that of the Epistle to the Romans without its precision and force (i. 1-4).

Servant of God (i. 1).—Paul does not so designate himself in the introductions to his Epistles.

According to the faith of God's elect (i. 1).—See note on "according to the promise," etc., 2 Tim. i. 1. This is the *faith* which *God's elect* have, the true faith held by all Christians, the catholic faith. The apostleship is also *according to the knowledge of the truth which is according to godliness*, and hence opposed to all forms of false teaching, the truth which corresponds to godliness, and is congruous with it.

In hope of eternal life (i. 2).—The doubtful relation of this phrase illustrates the writer's want of precision. It has been referred to *truth*, to *godliness*, and to both together, but probably was in the writer's mind related to *apostle*. The *eternal life* is that of the Messianic kingdom.¹

Which God who cannot lie promised before times eternal (i. 2).—*Which* relates to "life." *God* is so designated here only, but in substance in Heb. vi. 8.² *Before times eternal*. See Eph. i. 4; 1 Pet. i. 20.

But in His own seasons manifested His word (i. 3).—*In His*

¹ Rom. v. 2, viii. 21.

² See Rom. iii. 4.

own seasons is peculiar to the Pastoral Epistles.' Paul says "due season."²

In the message wherewith I was intrusted (i. 3).—The writer, speaking for Paul, represents him as preëminently the one through whom the word of God was manifested. In 2 Tim. i. 11, "the gospel" has the precedence. *God our Saviour*. See note on 2 Tim. i. 9.

The first theme of the Epistle is now developed in directions to Titus regarding the appointment of elders (i. 5-9).

The things that were wanting (i. 5).—An implication perhaps that Paul had been in Crete, and had left some matters unfinished. (See the Introduction to the three Epistles.)

As I gave thee charge (i. 5).—The charge having been given would naturally include the necessary particular directions. As these would render the Epistle unnecessary, so far at least as this matter is concerned, it appears as though the writer had for the time become inattentive to the part which he had assumed.

If any man is blameless, the husband of one wife (i. 6).—See note on 1 Tim. iii. 2, where the requirement regarding marriage is made respecting a bishop. *Having children that believe*. This condition surpasses in severity that laid down in 1 Tim. iii. 4, where "having his children in subjection" is the requirement. The word here rendered *that believe* (believing)³ generally means "trusty," "faithful," etc., but here, "holding the Christian faith" as opposed to all other beliefs and heresies. See also 1 Tim. iv. 3, 10, 12, v. 16, vi. 2.

For the bishop must be blameless as God's steward, etc. (i. 7).—The connection in which this officer is mentioned indicates that no distinction was made between "elders" or "presbyters" and "bishops." *Steward*. See 1 Cor. iv. 1; 1 Pet. iv. 10. *No brawler, no striker*.⁴ *Not greedy of filthy*

¹ 1 Tim. ii. 6, vi. 15.

² Gal. vi. 9.

³ πιστος.

⁴ 1 Tim. iii. 3.

lucre. Compare "no lover of money," *given to hospitality.* See 1 Tim. iii. 2, 3.

Holding to the faithful word, which is according to the teaching (i. 9).—The word is according to the [apostolical] teaching, and hence to be relied on, that is, opposed to the "profane babblings"¹ of the false teachers. *Sound doctrine.* Compare 1 Tim. vi. 3; 2 Tim. i. 13. *The gainsayers.* The false teachers. Compare 2 Tim. ii. 25.

Bishops of this sort are needed on account of these false teachers, to whom the writer now addresses himself in the second main division of the Epistle (i. 10-16).

For there are many unruly men, vain talkers and deceivers (i. 10).—*Vain talkers*, because they dealt in "myths and genealogies," "profane babblings," etc.² *Specially they of the circumcision.*³ Christians, doubtless, who had become infected with some of the heresies of the time. Since the false teachers are not elsewhere so designated in these Epistles, there is no ground for supposing that they were generally of Jewish descent.

Men who overthrow whole houses (i. 11), that is, disturb families by creating divisions through their false teaching, and all this *for filthy lucre's sake.* It should be considered that we have to do here with a statement coloured by a partisan interest. That the teachers in question should receive pay ought not to be occasion for reproach in view of 1 Cor. ix. 4-11; Gal. vi. 6; 2 Cor. xi. 7; Phil. iv. 10-15; 1 Tim. v. 17, 18.

One of themselves, a prophet of their own, said (i. 12).—*Prophet* occurs here only in the Pastoral Epistles. Apart from 2 Pet. ii. 16, the word is used in the New Testament for the Old Testament and Christian prophets and for Christ. Here it designates a heathen poet, a *vates*; indeed, according

¹ 2 Tim. ii. 16.

² 1 Tim. i. 6; 2 Tim. ii. 16.

³ Acts x. 45.

to some of the ancient commentators, it was Epimenides, whom Cicero mentions.

This testimony is true (i. 13).—A harsh judgment, an indiscriminating and uncharitable judgment.

For which cause reprove them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith. The argument seems to be, that reproof on account of lying, bestiality, and gluttony will have as its result that these people will become *sound in the faith*!

Jewish fables (i. 14).—Perhaps those of the later Jewish tradition, rabbinical and talmudic.

To the pure all things are pure, but to them that are defiled (i. 15).—This general principle is probably aimed at the prohibitions of certain foods.¹ *But both their mind and their conscience are defiled.* Mind (*νοῦς*)² designates the faculty of perceiving, judging, and feeling with reference to temporal and religious matters. *Conscience* is the discrimination of right and wrong respecting conduct.³

They profess that they know God (i. 16).—The false teachers claimed to have a superior knowledge (Gnosis) of God, but the writer regards this as no true knowledge, because its outward manifestation is a denial of Him, being *abominable and disobedient, and unto every good work reprobate*.

There follow various practical directions for the conduct of life (ii. 1-15).

But speak thou the things that befit the sound doctrine (ii. 1).—See i. 9; 1 Tim. i. 10; 2 Tim. iv. 3.

Aged men (ii. 2), not the "elders" of the Church but men advanced in years. *Temperate.* The Greek word occurs only in the Pastoral Epistles. See 1 Tim. iii. 2, 11, and means abstinence from the immoderate use of wine. Total abstinence is not enjoined in these Epistles. *Sound in the faith.* See i. 13.

¹ Rom. xiv. 20.

² 1 Tim. vi. 5; 2 Tim. iii. 8.

³ *συνειδησις*, Rom. ii. 15, ix. 1.

Not slanderers nor enslaved to much wine (ii. 3).—A curious collocation of ideas! Is the implication perhaps contained here that the aged woman may take a *little wine*¹ so as not to favour the asceticism of the false teachers?

That they may train the young women to love their husbands (ii. 5).—The preceding qualities of character are regarded as qualifying *aged women* to *train* the younger women to certain domestic virtues, to so educate them that they will love their husbands and children, being *in subjection* to the former.²

That he that is of the contrary part may be ashamed (ii. 8).—The expression, *he that is of the contrary part*, probably refers to such as would blaspheme the word of God (verse 5) in case the Christian women should not display the virtues mentioned in that connection, that is, the heathen.

Exhort servants to be in subjection to their own masters (ii. 9).—Similar directions are given respecting slaves in Eph. vi. 5 f.; Col. iii. 22 f.; 1 Pet. ii. 18 f.; 1 Tim. vi. 1, 2. (See notes on these.) Their condition receives ample attention in the later Epistles, but the system of which they are the victims is not condemned. It would appear that a considerable number of the converts to Christianity were among this unfortunate class.

For the grace of God hath appeared, bringing salvation to all men (ii. 11).—See note on 1 Tim. ii. 4. That the “grace” and “mercy” of God are extended *to all men* so that salvation is brought to them without discrimination, that is, is placed within their reach, is a Pauline doctrine in opposition to Jewish exclusiveness, and repetitions of it appear in the post-Pauline literature of the New Testament.³ Yet see Rom. ix. 16-18.

Instructing us to the intent that, etc. (ii. 12).—*Instructing* should be joined with *grace of God*. An educative power is

¹ 1 Tim. v. 23.

² Eph. v. 22; Col. iii. 8; 1 Pet. iii. 1.

³ Rom. v. 18, xi. 32; Acts xvii. 31; John iii. 16; 2 Pet. iii. 9.

accordingly attributed to *grace*, as with greater accuracy to the Scriptures in 2 Tim. iii. 16.

Looking for the blessed hope and appearing of the glory of our own great God and Saviour Jesus Christ (ii. 13).—*Hope* is used here for its object as in Gal. v. 5 and Rom. viii. 24. The question whether in the expression, *the glory of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ*, *God* is to be regarded as distinct from *Jesus Christ*, or the latter as called *God*, cannot be settled on grammatical grounds. The fact that there is no article before *Saviour* and the manifest reference of the words, “who gave himself for us,” etc., to Christ are favourable to the latter view. *Saviour* might, however, be a second subject introduced without the article as in 2 Pet. i. 1, “the grace of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ,” and 2 Thess. i. 12, “the grace of our God and Lord Jesus Christ.” Yet if two subjects were intended an “and” should be expected as in 1 Tim. i. 1; 2 Tim. i. 2, and Tit. i. 4. The usage of the New Testament writers may well be cited to decide the question, since the writer of this Epistle may be supposed to have been in accord with the ideas of his time on such a matter as this. Now, nowhere in the New Testament is “God” connected with “Christ” as an attribute, as if one should say “Christ our God,” or “our God Jesus Christ,” and “Lord” in connection with Christ does not mean “God,” while, as shown above, “God” and “Christ” are often mentioned together as separate personalities. Moreover, the adjective *great* indicates that God is to be regarded as distinct from Christ after the analogy of 1 Tim. i. 17, iv. 10, v. 15. Noyes’s rendering is not only grammatical, but in accordance with the general doctrine of the New Testament: “The glory of the great God and of our Saviour Jesus Christ.”

Appearing relates to Christ, and means his Parousia.

Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity (ii. 14).—*For us*, that is, for our sake. See Rom.

v. 8, viii. 31, 32, 34; 1 Cor. xi. 24; Gal. ii. 20; 1 Tim. ii. 6. *Redeem* here means to "cause to be delivered for one's self by the payment of the ransom." Jesus paid the ransom when he *gave himself*, that is, redeemed men by his "precious blood" (1 Pet. i. 18, 19). This is the Pauline doctrine¹—the idea of a purchase or buying off. "Ransom" or "redemption" occurs in Rom. iii. 24; 1 Cor. i. 30; Col. i. 14; Eph. i. 7. The expression here, however, is not strictly Pauline, for Paul does not speak of a redemption from *iniquity*, but from the "law" and "the curse of the law." "The condition from which according to Paul the death of Christ saves is not the moral quality of *iniquity*, but the religious condition of guilt with reference to God," that is, with reference to the "law," which is the expression of His will. The appropriation of the atonement of Christ through "faith" secured the "justification" of the sinner, in which condition he was "accounted" guiltless as to the law, or righteous, having "the righteousness which is of faith."²

And purify unto himself a peculiar people zealous of good works (ii. 14).—Purification as the result of Christ's sacrifice is not a Pauline conception, but belongs to the point of view of the Epistle to the Hebrews.³ It belongs to a later development of theological thinking which had no appreciation of Paul's teaching of a satisfaction of the law and a justification by faith.⁴

Zealous of good works (ii. 14).—Here we note the practical, ethical end of Christ's work, which is made prominent in the later Epistles.⁵ *Let no man despise thee* (ii. 15). See note on 1 Tim. iv. 12.

The Epistle is concluded with further exhortations, a surprising confession, directions about heretics, and salutations (iii. 1-15).

Put them in mind to be in subjection to rulers, to authorities

¹ 1 Cor. vi. 20, vii. 23; Gal. iii. 13; cf. 2 Pet. ii. 1.

² Rom. x. 6-10.

⁴ 1 John i. 7; 2 Pet. i. 9.

³ Heb. i. 3, ix. 14.

⁵ Eph. ii. 10; 1 Pet. i. 15-18.

(iii. 1).—This was perhaps suggested by Rom. xiii. 1., although Paul employs only the word here rendered *authorities*, there, “powers,” while he uses the two words together for the angelic powers.¹ See a similar use in Eph. i. 21, iii. 10, vi. 12; Col. i. 16, ii. 10, 15.

For we were aforetime foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hating one another (iii. 3).—The writer is here apparently carried away by his passion for accumulating words and exhausting his vocabulary, so that he overlooks the incongruity of making Paul, whom he personates, and includes by the use of *we*, guilty of offences to which the great apostle with all his self-depreciation would hardly have confessed, such as disobedience, malice and envy, hatefulness and a spirit of hatred. *Foolish*, without understanding.² Other writers of the later Epistles regard this state of mind as characteristic of the pre-Christian condition of men.³ *Deceived*. See 2 Tim. iii. 13. *Pleasures*. See Jas. iv. 1, 3; 2 Pet. ii. 13. *Envy*. See Rom. i. 29; Gal. v. 21; 1 Pet. ii. 1; Jas. iv. 5.

But when the kindness of God our Saviour and his love toward man appeared (iii. 4).—*Kindness*. Compare “the riches of His goodness,” Rom. ii. 4, and “if ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious,” 1 Pet. ii. 3. *And his love toward man*. The word expressing this quality appears in the New Testament only here and in Acts xxviii. 2.

Not by works done in righteousness, which we did ourselves (iii. 5).—This is in accord with Rom. ix. 11; Gal. ii. 16; Eph. ii. 9. *But according to His mercy He saved us*. See Eph. ii. 7, 8. In 2 Tim. i. 9 the “grace” and “purpose” of God are set over against “works” as *mercy* is here.

Through the washing of regeneration (iii. 5), that is, through baptism. Compare Eph. v. 26, and “the washing of water with the word,” Heb. x. 23. The word rendered *regeneration* appears elsewhere in the New Testament only

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 24. ² 1 Eph. iv. 18. ³ 1 Pet. i. 14; Heb. v. 2, ix. 7.

in Matt. xix. 28, where it means the renewal of all things at the Parousia. Here it designates the new birth of the individual, the putting on of the new man. It is connected with baptism, and regarded as effected by the Spirit as in John iii. 5, "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." *Renewing*. See Rom. xii. 2 ; 2 Cor. iv. 16 ; Col. iii. 10 ; Heb. vi. 6.

Which He poured out upon us richly through Jesus Christ our Saviour (iii. 6).—Compare Rom. v. 5, "the love of God hath been shed abroad in our hearts through the Holy Ghost." *Poured forth*. See Acts ii. 17, 18, 33, x. 45. The Holy Ghost was supposed to be *poured out* at baptism—an idea unknown to Paul. *Through Jesus Christ*. Christ is the mediator of all the spiritual gifts and blessings bestowed on believers. The doctrine of the communication of the Spirit is Pauline.¹

That, being justified by his grace, we might be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life (iii. 7).—The object of the pouring out of the Spirit is thus stated. *Justified*. This Pauline term does not appear elsewhere in the Pastoral Epistles with reference to salvation. *His grace* is that of Christ as in Acts xvii. ; Rom. v. 5 ; 2 Cor. viii. 9, xiii. 13 ; Gal. i. 6. Yet it may be grammatically related to God, the subject of "poured out." *Heirs* is used here only in the Pastoral Epistles, and should probably be joined with *eternal life*—*heirs of eternal life according to hope*. The *eternal life* is that of the Messianic kingdom, which was the object of the *hope* of the primitive Christians, their "inheritance," the great consummation of which they had the "promise."²

Faithful is the saying (iii. 8).—This relates to the foregoing. *Concerning these things*, that is, the things mentioned in verses 3-7.

¹ 1 Cor. ii. 12, vi. 19 ; 2 Cor. i. 22 ; Gal. iv. 6 ; 1 Thess. iv. 8.

² Rom. viii. 17 ; Col. iii. 24 ; 1 Cor. vi. 9, xv. 50 ; Gal. v. 21 ; Jas. ii. 5.

That they which have believed God may be careful to maintain good works (iii. 8).—This exhortation is not in the line of the Pauline “justification through faith,” but rather in accord with the later tendency to emphasise *works*, which are here brought into close connection with faith, as if the watchword had become, as in the Epistle of James, faith *and* works instead of the Pauline faith *versus* works.

These things are good and profitable unto men (iii. 8).—This flat utilitarianism is the highest ethical note struck in the Pastoral Epistles.¹

But shun foolish questionings and genealogies (iii. 9).—See 1 Tim. i. 4, vi. 4.

A man that is heretical (iii. 10).—*Heretical*² is not elsewhere used in the New Testament. Paul uses “heresies” to designate divisions in the churches³ without reference to erroneous doctrines. The same word is translated “sect” in Acts v. 17, xv. 5, xxvi. 5, “sect of the Pharisees,” etc. According to the connection here the adjective *heretical* designates a false teacher or a follower of those who introduced “foolish questionings,” “myths,” etc. Such a man should be avoided, if two *admonitions* are not effective for his correction. With reference to the relations of believers with objectionable persons see also 1 Cor. v. 9, 11; 2 Thess. iii. 14; 2 John 10.

Artemas (iii. 12).—Not elsewhere mentioned. *Tychicus*. See 2 Tim. ii. 23.

Zenas (iii. 13).—Only here.

Good works (iii. 14).—Inept in this connection.

¹ 1 Tim. iv. 8.

² αἵρετικός.

³ 1 Cor. xi. 19; Gal. v. 20.

SOME DOCTRINAL POINTS OF VIEW OF THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

No one can read these Epistles in connection with those which are unquestionably of Pauline authorship without being impressed with the wide departure which they show from the distinctive doctrinal points of view of the apostle. Although they are not, like Paul's letters, dominated by a theological purpose, and in this respect present a striking contrast to them, yet they contain sufficient intimations of doctrinal opinions and tendencies to indicate that they occupy a place by themselves in the theological and religious development of primitive Christianity. While the writer assumed the part of the apostle¹ and evidently wished to set forth his teaching, so far as he expressed any theological doctrines at all, the Time-Spirit was too strong for him, and the Paulinism which he actually represents is that of a later time than the apostolic age, a Paulinism transformed in being transplanted into an age which had no interest in the problems with which it was originally concerned, but which was chiefly occupied with questions of ecclesiastical organisation and a conflict with manifold heresies.

The Pauline point of view respecting salvation as not due to desert on account of works but to the mercy and grace of God is represented especially in 2 Tim. i. 9 and Tit. iii. 4. Yet here the original Pauline doctrine appears in a partial expression without its distinctive contrast of faith and works and its conception of justification through faith. The idea of the death of Christ as a "ransom" is, indeed, expressed, but the Pauline doctrine of a ransom from "the curse of the law" does not appear.² In place of it we have the conception of the work of Christ as "redeeming us from all iniquity," and "purifying unto himself a peculiar people"—the later ethical instead of the original, Pauline, legal point of view. This emasculated Paulinism is familiar

¹ 1 Tim. ii. 7; 2 Tim. i. 11, 15, iv. 17.

² 1 Tim. ii. 6; Tit. ii. 14.

to the hearers of the popular "evangelical" preaching of the present time. In connection with the doctrine of the result of Christ's work, which finds incidental mention in these Epistles, may be mentioned the abolishing of death. This is a genuinely Pauline idea, although the form of expression is not that of the apostle, and the teaching that this end is effected "through the gospel," that is, through the influence of the word of Christ, makes primary the ethical and pedagogic aspect of the matter, which with Paul was secondary.

According to Paul death, which came through Adam's sin, and "passed upon all men, in that all sinned," was put away by the sacrifice of Christ, "the last Adam," as the representative of the human race, who bore "the curse of the law" for men. In its extreme and most intense significance it was deprivation of the resurrection at the Parousia and of the joys of the Messianic kingdom, and could be escaped only by faith. But the death and resurrection of Christ, which were in the apostle's thought fundamental in the saving work of Jesus, have only incidental mention in these Epistles, and faith does not hold, as it does in the doctrine of Paul, the place of chief importance. Good works, godliness, and piety are, however, prominently mentioned.¹ Instead of denoting, as in the apostle's thought, an attitude of the individual, faith finds its conspicuous mention as a doctrine, a "sound doctrine," or, in other words, the belief of the whole (catholic) Church, a creed which the exigencies of the time required to be emphasised in the conflict with "heretics."

The prominence given in these Epistles to God and His attributes is noteworthy. He is strangely not designated at all as "our Father," but He is called "the only God,"² "one God,"³ "the only Potentate,"⁴ "the king invisible,"⁵ "the living God,"⁶ "almighty,"⁷ "who cannot lie," and "faithful,"⁸ "incorruptible," "who only hath immortality,"⁹ "blessed," and "dwelling in light unapproachable."¹⁰ Peculiar to the Pastoral Epistles is His designation as "Saviour," with the exception of Jude 25, and Luke i. 47.¹¹ See also 2 Tim. i. 9. Since Gnosticism made a distinction between the

¹ 1 Tim. ii. 2, 10, iii. 16, iv. 7, 8, v. 10, vi. 3, 5, 6, 11; 2 Tim. iii. 5, 12, 16; Tit. i. 1, ii. 12.

² 1 Tim. i. 17.

³ *Ibid.* ii. 5.

⁴ *Ibid.* vi. 15.

⁵ *Ibid.* i. 17, vi. 16.

⁶ *Ibid.* iii. 15, iv. 10.

⁷ *Ibid.* i. 17, vi. 15.

⁸ Tit. i. 1; 2 Tim. ii. 13.

⁹ 1 Tim. i. 17, vi. 16.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* vi. 15, 16.

¹¹ *Ibid.* i. 1, ii. 3, iv. 10; Tit. i. 3, ii. 10, iii. 4.

Creator-God and the Saviour, it has been conjectured that this emphatic designation of God as Saviour had reference to that heresy. The fact that the doctrine appears to a considerable extent in liturgical formulas, which von Soden instances as opposed to this opinion, counts for little, since a motive may well be assumed for such citations.

Some peculiar points of view respecting the person of Christ (Christology) deserve consideration. The Christology is expressed in Pauline formulas, but the conception cannot be said to be on the whole essentially Pauline. Jesus is nowhere called "the Son of God," and "Christ" alone only once (1 Tim. v. 11), while "Christ Jesus" and "Lord" are the usual designations. Once he is expressly called "man."¹ He is declared to have been "of the seed of David."² The doctrine of Jesus' preëxistence which Paul teaches in 1 Cor. viii. 6, x. 4; 2 Cor. viii. 9; Phil. ii. 7, 8, and which finds expression in Heb. ii. 16, 17, is mentioned in the Johannine formula 1 Tim. i. 15 and in 2 Tim. i. 10, where "the appearing of our Saviour Christ Jesus" implies an existence prior to his manifestation to men. See also "manifested in the flesh."³ That the emphasising of his humanity and of his real appearance in the flesh is due to an opposition to Gnostic teachings and to Docetism, which denied the reality of his flesh, cannot properly be called "unthinkable," with von Soden. In view of the anti-heretical tendency of the Epistles this explanation is at least probable. The ascription of a doxology to him ("Lord" doubtless referring to Christ) in 2 Tim. iv. 18 is unique with the exception of Heb. xiii. 21; 2 Pet. iii. 18; Rom. ix. 5 being doubtful, but probably containing an ascription of praise to God, "who is over all." In accordance with the general New Testament usage Jesus is designated "Saviour" in 2 Tim. i. 10 (see ii. 10 and in Tit. i. 4, ii. 13 iii. 6).

In accord with Paul and with the prevalent belief of the primitive Christians "the last days" are at least incidentally recognised and the Parousia appears as a tenet of the common faith. "The present distress" of which Paul vaguely speaks in 1 Cor. vii. 26 is here more definitely characterised as "the last days" in which all sorts of evil men, the random catalogue of whose abominations is characteristic of the style of the writer, will appear, among whom are the false teachers who "are never able to come to a knowledge of the truth."⁴

¹ 1 Tim. ii. 5; cf. Rom. v. 15; 1 Cor. xv. 21.

² 2 Tim. ii. 8; cf. Rom. i. 3. ³ 1 Tim. iii. 16. ⁴ 2 Tim. iii. 1-9.

Doubtless these moral and spiritual degeneracies were phenomena present to the mind of the author, who speaks of them prophetically in accordance with the fiction of his authorship. He is evidently in uncertainty as to the time of the "appearing" of Christ,¹ but could not have thought of it as far in the future, since he exhorts to a sober and godly life in view of its arrival within the lifetime of his readers. But he gives directions for the regulation of the affairs of the Church as if he expected that institution to have a long life. God will "show" "the appearing of our Lord," however, "in its own times." The writer is not at all events in accord with Paul regarding the Parousia so far as the latter's personal relation to it is concerned. For he represents the apostle as on the point of dying a martyr's death,² while Paul sometimes speaks of himself as expecting to be among the living who should "remain" at the time of the second coming of Christ.³ If we render the "we" in these passages as "those of us," the possibility of the apostle's presence among them is at least implied, and this is excluded in 2 Tim. iv. 6, and, indeed, the writer could not well have represented a man whom he knew to be dead as possibly participating, as living, in the Parousia. Moreover, in Paul's thought the Messianic kingdom was to be established only at Christ's second coming. How, then, exposed to dying a martyr's death before the advent of that kingdom, could he be "saved into" it?⁴ Paul knew nothing of a "heavenly kingdom" of Christ, and when he speaks of being absent from the body and at home with the Lord,⁵ he does not imply an entrance into the "kingdom" of Christ. This implies only an apparently hoped-for exceptional deliverance from a tarrying in the underworld until the resurrection at the Parousia.

¹ 1 Tim. vi. 14 ; 2 Tim. iv. 1 ; Tit. iii. 13.

² 2 Tim. iv. 16.

³ 1 Thess. iii. 17 ; 1 Cor. xv. 2.

⁴ 2 Tim. iv. 18.

⁵ 2 Cor. v. 8.

THE EPISTLE OF JAMES.

INTRODUCTION.

THREE men bearing the name of James are prominently mentioned in the New Testament, James the son of Zebedee, an apostle, who was put to death about A.D. 44,¹ James the less,² the son of Alphæus, also an apostle, and James the brother of Jesus.³ The James mentioned by Paul in Gal. ii. 9, 12 as foremost among the leaders ("pillars") of the Church in Jerusalem should doubtless be regarded as the brother of Jesus of i. 19. His prominence in the Church is evident from this passage, and in 1 Cor. ix. 5 "brethren of the Lord," among whom James is probably to be included, are mentioned between "the rest of the apostles and Cephas." The same James is probably the one mentioned in 1 Cor. xv. 7 as one to whom the risen Christ "appeared." In Acts, after the account of the execution of James the son of Zebedee, mention is made of a James as practically the head of the Church in Jerusalem.⁴ Very early traditions of the Church represent James the brother of Jesus as a bishop of the original Church in Jerusalem and chief bishop of all Christendom. In view of the prominence of this James it is probable that the writer of the so-called Epistle of James wished to pass for the brother of Jesus.

The object of the Epistle is to correct certain evil conditions

¹ Acts xii. 2.

³ Matt. xiii. 55 ; Gal. i. 19.

² Mark xv. 40.

⁴ Acts xii. 17, xv. 13, xxi. 18.

in the Church, avarice, worldliness, contempt of the poor, sins of the tongue, absorption in trade, profanity, etc. The theme is the perfect man (iii. 2), whether Christian or not, and the writing is unique among those of the New Testament in the absence of specifically Christian conceptions. Almost all its precepts are borrowed from the practical morality of the Old Testament, or may at least be found in that book, and of such doctrines as those of grace, atonement, and salvation there is no mention. Prominent characters in Old Testament history, prophets and saints, are held up as examples (v. 10, 11, 17, 18), and receive more attention than Christ, who is mentioned by name only twice (i. 1, ii. 1).

The unique address of the Epistle presents a problem on the solution of which scholars are unable to agree. A writer representing himself as "James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ," writes a letter "to the twelve tribes which are of the Dispersion," that is, apparently to the Jews scattered about. The problem is again complicated by the circumstance that the contents do not fit the vagueness of the address, since definite and local conditions are implied in several passages (iv. 1-3, 13, v. 1-6). Since the Epistle, if it is of Christian origin, cannot have been addressed to Jews, we are left to choose between Jewish-Christian readers, Christians in general, or gentile Christians. The data furnished in the Epistle do not warrant a positive conclusion as to the persons addressed.

Since the Epistle contains no reference to the early controversy respecting the relations of Jewish and gentile Christians in the Church, it was written either before that controversy broke out, or after it had died away. The latter alternative must be taken on account of the relation of the Epistle to other New Testament writings, which shows their priority and its dependence. That the writer was acquainted with Romans and probably with 1 Corinthians,

Hebrews, and 1 Peter is conceded by many competent judges. If a literary dependence on the last two cannot be shown with certainty, there is at least a high degree of probability that the writer was familiar with their ideas and general mode of thought, and was accordingly nearly contemporary with their authors. Moreover, the reference to the pursuit of riches, to the preponderating influence of wealthy men in the Church, and to a wide-reaching degeneration, indicates that the writer had before him, not the primitive simplicity of the early Christian communities, but the conditions of a later time. All the so-called burning questions of primitive Christianity, the proof of Jesus' Messiahship from the Old Testament, the relation of his death to salvation, and his resurrection appear to lie outside of the writer's horizon of thought and interest.

The Epistle is peculiar among the New Testament writings in that it contains an attempt at a pointed refutation of the teaching of another canonical writer. The passage ii. 14-26 is directly aimed at Paul's doctrine of faith. This is evident, whether the author correctly apprehended the Pauline teaching on the subject or not, from the fact that he employs the apostle's terms in order to reject their import (see "apart from works," Jas. ii. 18, 20 and Rom. iii. 28, also "justified by works," Jas. ii. 24 and Gal. ii. 16), and instances with an opposite intention the case of Abraham.¹ It appears from the construction which the writer puts upon "faith" either that he himself misunderstood the original Pauline doctrine concerning it, or was opposing a degenerate form of it.

It is evident to the careful student of Paul and of this Epistle that the apostle teaches that on account of the atonement of Christ a man may through faith be *declared* righteous, although so far as works are concerned he be not righteous at all. Since Christ in his death, having been "made sin" for him, became "the end of the law," his

¹ Jas. ii. 23 and Rom. iv. 1-5, 19.

trespasses are not reckoned to him,¹ so soon as he becomes a believer. Yet upon the man who has once come into this condition of imputed or "forensic" righteousness Paul lays unequivocally the obligations of a life of righteousness by works, and declares that every believer will be judged according to his deeds.² The writer of James does not appear to have correctly apprehended the Pauline teaching.

The adoption of the alternative that he was opposing a later form of Paulinism requires a later date for the Epistle than the former which, of course, demands that it be placed long enough after Paul for his teaching to have become known to the wide circle of readers addressed in James. Moreover, the reference to Rahab is probably directed against the teaching in Heb. ix. 31, and since this Epistle was written toward the end of the first century, the presumption in favour of the polemic in James being directed against a perverted form of Paul's doctrine of faith is thereby strengthened. The opinion is probably correct that the section on faith and works does not represent a part of the real purpose of the Epistle, since the writer was not a dogmatist, and had no sympathy with doctrinal controversies as such. His real contest is against worldliness and the love of riches and the oppression of the poor (iv. 1-5). It has been conjectured, too, with considerable reason that he had in view in chapter iii. certain false teachers who were giving currency to an assumed "wisdom," which he visits with a harsh condemnation. He knew of a "faction" which led men to "lie against the truth," and since the terms which he employs resemble those used in *Hermas* against the false teachers of the early part of the second century, the judgment of those scholars may be well founded who think that he had the same persons in mind.

It has long been observed that the maxims of the Epistle have a resemblance to many of the sayings attributed to Jesus in the synoptic Gospels, especially to those of the Ser-

¹ 2 Cor. v. 19.

² Rom. ii. 6, xi. 22; 2 Cor. v. 10.

mon on the Mount, although Spitta, who maintains that it is not a Christian, but a Jewish writing of an early date, finds parallels to all these in the Jewish literature. The writer may have known Matthew and Luke, but there is no evidence of a direct literary dependence upon them. Since the source of his maxims cannot be determined, their presence does not prove that he wrote at a time when they were current in tradition only, that is, prior to the composition of our synoptic Gospels (A.D. 70-90).

The Epistle did not fare well as to recognition in the early Church. The canon of Muratori omits it, and the earliest trace of an acquaintance with it is found in Irenæus, who refers to Abraham as "the friend of God" (Jas. ii. 23), but he does not mention the Epistle. From Tertullian's silence regarding the Epistle it must be concluded that he either was unacquainted with it, or, knowing it, regarded it as spurious. Eusebius, in writing of it as an historian, classifies it as among the controverted books, and says that it is reckoned spurious, and that not many of the ancients have mentioned it. Yet in his commentary on the Psalms he quotes it as "the holy apostle's." Doubtful traces of its use by Clement of Alexandria are found in his writings, although he is said by Eusebius to have written commentaries on all the Catholic Epistles. Good reasons, however, for doubting his acquaintance with it are given by Salmon. Origen knew and quoted an Epistle of which he spoke doubtfully as "reputed to be James's." Jerome, while acknowledging its genuineness, remarks that it was said to be published by another in the name of James, though it gradually acquired authority.

Conjectures as to the author must be fruitless. That James the brother of Jesus could not have written the Epistle is evident, for even in a practical, hortatory writing like this, allusions to conditions of the early years of Christianity, the doctrines, the questions at issue, and above all to the person and history of Jesus, instead of to Old Testament characters, must have escaped from the pen of such a man. Besides, the Greek style may well be declared impossible to the son of Joseph and Mary. That this champion of the law against

Paul, this "pillar" of legalism, should have so far misunderstood the apostle's position as to misapprehend his doctrine of "works of the law" is improbable. The time of the composition is indeterminable, but it has been well observed that the later we place it the more comprehensible become the presupposed conditions among the Christians, such as persecutions, the limitation of miraculous powers to officers of the Church (v 14), the moralising character pertaining to the time of the formation of the Catholic Church, the conflict against false teachers, the departure from the leading ideas of Paul, and the relation of dependence on the earlier Christian literature. There are good reasons for dating it in the early years of the second century.¹

¹ See the writer's article, "James, Epistle of," in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, vol. ii.

THE EPISTLE OF JAMES.

EXPOSITION.

The Epistle opens with a greeting to the readers, after which follow maxims regarding patience, temptation, hearing and doing, and true religion (i. 1-27).

James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ (i. 1).—The writer does not call himself an apostle, but after Paul's manner when associated with one who was not an apostle, a *servant*.¹

To the twelve tribes (i. 1).—According to Gal. vi. 16; Rom. ii. 29, this address might refer to Christians as the "true Israel," the real inheritors of the "promise." But the question naturally arises whether the writer would be likely to refine in this manner when writing an address. Whoever wrote the address, and it is not certain that it was written by the writer of the rest of the Epistle, must have had in mind Jews or Jewish Christians. The writing has not the character of an Epistle, but rather that of a homily, and the address may have been prefixed by some one who was impressed with its Jewish tendency.

Manifold temptations (i. 2).—*Temptations* are generally understood to refer to the persecutions to which the Christians were subjected, yet *manifold* renders the term inclusive of more. Perhaps trials, including persecution, were in the writer's mind.²

¹ Phil. i. 1.

² See 1 Pet. i. 6.

The proof of your faith worketh patience (i. 3).—This is the reason for rejoicing at temptations.

And let patience have her perfect work (i. 4).—See Heb. x. 36. *Perfect and entire*, that is, may appear before the judgment of Christ at the Parousia without blame.¹

But if any of you lacketh wisdom, let him ask of God, etc. (i. 5).—Practical wisdom in the conduct of life is doubtless meant (see iii. 13-17). The idea that wisdom is a gift of God is expressed in Prov. ii. 6.

In faith (i. 6), that is, in confidence that God will grant what is asked. *For he that doubteth*, etc. The primary reference is to one praying in doubt, as is evident from i. 7, *let not that man think*, etc.

A double-minded man (i. 8).—He who prays for wisdom must have his mind single toward God in "faith."

But let the brother of low degree glory in his high estate (i. 9).—The abruptness of the transition is apparent. *Low degree* is to be taken literally, as poor or oppressed. Let such a one *glory* in his inner integrity, and perhaps also in the hope of future exaltation in the Messianic kingdom.

And the rich in that he is made low (i. 10), because his riches are temporary and fleeting, and though he be *made low* by affliction and distress, his true exaltation must be, like that of the poor man, inward.²

For the sun ariseth with the scorching wind, etc. (i. 11).—The figure is borrowed from Isa. xl. 6-8; Ps. xc. 6, ciii. 15; Job. xiv. 2.

Blessed is the man that endureth temptation (i. 12).—The writer here returns to the thought in verse 2 f. *The man*, whether poor or rich. *The crown of life*. It is uncertain whether the future reward in the Messianic kingdom is here referred to, as it evidently is in 1 Pet. v. 4. *Of life* is probably the "genitive of opposition," the crown which is life.

¹ 1 Cor. i. 8; Phil. i. 10, ii. 15-17; 1 Thess. v. 23.

² Luke xvi. 15.

According to the "Christian consciousness" of the age "eternal life" at the Parousia should here be implied, and "life" must be so interpreted if "*the Lord*," which is supplied as the subject of *promised*, be Christ. But there is no subject in the original, according to the best authenticated reading, and the subject may be "God."

Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God, etc. (i. 13).—Temptation in general is probably here meant, according to verse 14. It is thought by some that the writer here opposes the fatalism of certain Gnostic teachers of the second century. This reference is not necessary, while it is probable that he knew that the doctrine which he opposed was advanced from some quarter.

For God cannot be tempted with evil (i. 13).—The Greek word rendered *cannot be tempted with* is capable of the sense "has no experience of," and this is perhaps a preferable translation.

But each man is tempted when he is drawn away by his own lust, and enticed (i. 14).—The word rendered *lust* is used in the New Testament, when it stands without a qualifying term, in the sense of "evil desire," as in Romans vii. 7, translated "lust" in King James' version, but less appropriately "coveting" in the revised.

Then the lust, when it hath conceived, beareth sin (i. 15).—The figure of the conception of desire (feminine) was probably taken at random by the writer and without so much refinement of imagination as is shown by some of his expositors, who suppose the will of the subject to be the other party to the conceiving. Psychologically sin is an act prompted by desire; but that desire is pregnant with and *brings forth* the monster is a poetic fiction.

And the sin, when it is full grown, bringeth forth death (i. 15).—The figure is carried further, and the child of desire becomes the mother of death. So it pleased the writer's fancy to represent the relation of cause and effect. Death is

regarded as the penalty of sin (see iv. 12) in accordance with the Pauline doctrine,¹ with which the writer was evidently acquainted. It is not merely mortality, but also the opposite of "life" in the technical Pauline sense, that is, exclusion from the Messianic kingdom, which would include only those who should here believe in Christ, those who should be "his at his coming."

The Pauline doctrine of the entrance of death into the world presents a contradiction in thought (technically, an antinomy). "By one man," that is, Adam, he says, "sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, for that all sinned," namely, individually, and not "in Adam."² Yet it is a fundamental doctrine of his anthropology that "the flesh," which is the substance of man's physical organism, is "corruptible" or naturally subject to death.³ As the seat of sin, of "the law in the members," it must be regarded as the primal occasion of all sin conceived as a power or principle, and hence as mortal in itself. Accordingly, its mortality or corruptibility cannot have been caused by the "transgression" of Adam or by the transgressions of his posterity. These two teachings, then, appear to stand over against each other: That had there been no act of sin, man would have been immortal; and that, as being "of flesh," he is naturally mortal. The apostle does not teach that either sin or death descended by heredity from Adam to his posterity. "In Adam all die"⁴ means that since all men, like Adam, the "psychical" or natural head of the race, partake of his nature, they must be mortal, just as he, being "of flesh," "of the earth, earthy," was naturally mortal. The power over death, "incorruption," immortality, came only through "the second man, the Lord from heaven."⁵ On the ground of their relation to "the first man" ("in Adam") all men die; but on the ground of their relation to "the second man" ("in Christ") all may by faith be "made alive," that is, may attain the resurrection at "the end," since he is "a life-giving Spirit."

Be not deceived (i. 16).—Perhaps a reference to false teachers. This admonition probably refers to the foregoing.

¹ Rom. vi. 23.

² *Ibid.* v. 12.

³ 1 Cor. xv. 53.

⁴ *Ibid.* xv. 22.

⁵ *Ibid.* xv. 47.

But the connection here, as throughout the Epistle, is very loose.

Every good gift and every perfect boon is from above, coming down from the Father of lights (i. 17).—This comports with the teaching of verse 5. *Father of lights* means the Creator of the heavenly luminaries. This designation of God is not found elsewhere either in the Old or the New Testament. Although He is the *Father of lights*, He has no change (*variation*) like that of the moon or shadow of a *turning*, like that from morning to evening.

Of His own will He brought us forth by the word of truth (i. 18).—Expositors have applied their ingenuity to the task of finding a logical connection for this verse. It is neither “a proof that God cannot be a tempter,” nor “a logical conclusion from the preceding verse.” Possibly it may be regarded as beginning a new subject and supplying a basis for the exhortations that follow. *The word of truth* is the gospel. *First-fruits*, that is, first-chosen to the new life in Christ.¹

But let every man be swift to hear, etc. (i. 19).—Hearing may perhaps be referred to “the word of truth” (verse 18). See verses 21, 22. The terms *swift* and *slow* do not elsewhere appear in the New Testament in the senses here intended.

The righteousness of God (i. 20).—This expression is of doubtful meaning, since the Greek genitive is capable of several significations. “The righteousness which God effects in man” seems inappropriate, since no one would think that man’s wrath could have this result. Perhaps the righteousness acceptable to God or willed by Him may be the meaning.

The implanted word (i. 21).—This is “the word of truth” (verse 18). This is regarded as *implanted* in the hearts of the believers, although there is an apparent incongruity in

¹ Rom. xvi. 5; 1 Cor. xvi. 15.

exhorting them to *receive* it. *Able to save your souls*, "the power of God unto salvation."¹

But be ye doers of the word (i. 22).—See Matt. vii. 24-29.

For if any man is a hearer (i. 23, 24).—The comparison to looking in a *mirror* and forgetting *what manner of man he was* need not be pressed so far as to the supposition that the writer intended to compare the word of God to a mirror in which men may see their true character reflected. The point of the comparison lies in the look into the mirror and the turning away and forgetting. So is he who only hears and does not appropriate the word permanently in his life.

But he that looketh into the perfect law of liberty, etc. (i. 25).—This *perfect law* is probably "the word of truth" (verse 18). The influence of Pauline ideas is apparent in designating it as *the perfect law of liberty*.² Yet the Jewish literature contains expressions to the effect that "he only is free who is a pupil of the law." The doing of the law is, of course, a Jewish precept, and Jesus in emphasising it followed the great teachers of his people.

If any man thinketh himself to be religious while he bridleth not his tongue, etc. (i. 26).—The writer here returns to the remark "slow to speak" (verse 19). The word rendered *religious*³ is not used elsewhere in the New Testament, and does not occur in classic Greek. It refers rather to the outward service of God than to an inward state.

Pure religion and undefiled before God and our Father (i. 27).—To the religion that is "vain," mentioned in the preceding verse, is here opposed that which is *pure and undefiled*. *Before God*, etc., that is, as He must regard it in His sight.

To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction and to keep himself [oneself] unspotted from the world (i. 27).—This is the religion of "works" in the sense in which the writer understood that word. Its externality fits well with the

¹ Rom. i. 16.

² Gal. v. 1.

³ θρησκός.

meaning of the word which he uses for "religion"—the noun corresponding to the adjective translated "religious" employed in verse 26. A definition of religion which includes only the moral virtues of helpfulness and purity must be regarded as quite one-sided and inadequate.

The readers are now admonished not to have respect to persons, and in connection with the keeping of the law mention is made of the law of liberty (ii. 1-13).

My brethren, hold not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory, with respect of persons (ii. 1).—Expositors have had no little difficulty with the accumulation of epithets here, the original reading, "faith of the Lord of us Jesus Christ of glory" Probably the expression *of glory* should be regarded as qualifying *our Lord Jesus Christ* and not any part of the phrase, as "Lord of glory," etc. *Faith of our Lord Jesus Christ* is faith in Christ. This, the writer says, should not be had in such a way as to pay regard to persons, that is, as believers in Christ his readers are exhorted to pay no heed to outward distinctions.

For if there come into your synagogue a man with a gold ring, etc. (ii. 2, 3).—*Synagogue*, although the name for the Jews' place of assembly for worship, was also applied to that for Christian worship. Here it designates simply an assembly.

Are ye not divided in your own mind (ii. 4).—The division is one of discriminating, judging, becoming doubtful (see verse 6). In making a distinction between rich and poor they doubt the Christian gospel, which attaches no importance to external conditions.

Did not God choose them that are poor as to the world (ii. 5)?—The *poor* are the object of consideration in the Jewish literature nearly contemporary with the origin of Christianity. In the book of Enoch the poor who are oppressed by the rich are repeatedly called "the elect." In the synoptic

Gospels they are especially mentioned as the ones to whom Christ came.¹

Heirs of the kingdom which He promised to them that love Him (ii. 5).—On condition of being *rich in faith* the poor are the ones especially chosen to be *heirs of the kingdom*, that is, of the Messianic kingdom which Christ was expected speedily to come to establish. The idea that believers were to be the heirs of the coming kingdom finds frequent expression in the Epistles.²

But ye have dishonoured the poor man (ii. 6).—This statement appears to point to local conditions known by the writer.

Do not the rich oppress you, and themselves drag you before the judgment-seats (ii. 6)?—If these forms of injury be regarded as inflicted in matters of money on account of debt, etc., it is not necessary to suppose that *the rich* were thought of as outside the churches.

Blaspheme the honourable name (ii. 7), that is, by their unchristian conduct in oppressing the poor.³

Howbeit, if ye fulfil the royal law according to the Scriptures (ii. 8).—*Royal*, because chief.⁴ *Law* is here used for “commandment.”

For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and stumble (ii. 10).—The disposition to break the law is present if a man *stumble in one point*, that is, err in respect to one commandment. This doctrine was taught by the Jewish Rabbis.

By a law of liberty (ii. 12).—This is the Christian law as opposed to the Jewish,⁵ and is mentioned in i. 25 as “the perfect law.”

¹ Matt. xi. 5; Luke vi. 26, vii. 22, xiv. 13.

² Rom. viii. 7; Gal. iii. 29; Eph. iii. 16; Tit. iii. 7; Heb. vi. 7.

³ 1 Tim. vi. 1; Tit. ii. 5.

⁴ Matt. xxii. 39; Rom. xiii. 8-10; Gal. v. 14; 1 Tim. i. 5.

⁵ Gal. ii. 4, v. 1, 13.

*For judgment is without mercy (ii. 13).—“Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy.”*¹

Proceeding from the point of view of i. 22, 25, respecting the importance of men being “doers of the word,” the writer now undertakes a refutation of the teaching that faith without works can save (ii. 14-26).

What doth it profit, my brethren, if a man say he hath faith, but have not works? Can that faith save him (ii. 14)?—This question implies that the writer had some person or persons in mind who maintained the proposition that faith without works was sufficient for salvation. The way in which the terms “faith” and “works” are introduced cannot but give the impression that they were well known, and that the writer assumed his readers to have been familiar with them in their relation to each other. *If a man say*, etc., is probably not to be interpreted, “if a man pretend that he has faith.”

What doth it profit (ii. 14)? evidently refers to the interest of the man who makes this claim. What good does it do him so far as saving him is concerned? Can he expect to be an “heir” of the Messianic kingdom on the strength of his faith, of such a faith?

The Epistle really contains no doctrine of faith and no adequate conception of it as a principle of salvation. In i. 6 and v. 15 the word signifies no more than “confidence.” In ii. 1 faith in Christ as “the Lord of Glory” is mentioned without attaching to it any inward, spiritual significance and with an immediate practical application to “respect of persons.” With respect to God it is simply a metaphysical belief that He exists (ii. 19). The Pauline conception of it in relation to the atonement of Christ is not mentioned in the Epistle. In fact, the atonement has no recognition, and there is no indication that the writer believed that faith has any relation to it. Accordingly, the inference which has been drawn from these facts, that the decisive weight which Paul laid upon the atoning suffering and death of Christ was offensive to the writer, is not without justification.

¹ Matt. v. 7.

If a brother or sister be naked, etc. (ii. 15, 16).—The example adduced represents the case of a man appealed to for charity, who should say to himself that he has faith and expects to be saved by it, and accordingly refuses the charitable offices, simply sending the applicant away. The writer well asks, *What doth it profit?* Is a man who possesses such a disposition fit for the kingdom of God? But that this is a caricature of Paul's position respecting faith and works is evident from 1 Cor. xiii., and the writer either misunderstood the apostle's doctrine or directed his argument against those who held a perverted form of it. A man who had faith in Paul's sense could not omit such "works" as are mentioned here, but the apostle would never have said that a man could be "justified by works" (vv. 24, 25). Our author overlooks Paul's conception of "grace" in justification, which is accorded "through faith" by reason of Christ's having borne "the curse of the law" for men and delivered them from "bondage" to it. Paul's doctrine relates to becoming a Christian, while our author has in mind those who are already Christians.

The writer here introduces another person who takes up the argument, and contends against the false faith (ii. 18-23).

Yea, a man will say, Show me thy faith apart from thy works (ii. 18).—That is, convince me without the doing of works that you have faith, and I will show you that I have faith by doing works, or, in other words, I will prove that your faith is "dead."

Thou believest that God is one (ii. 19).—This sort of belief has, of course, no resemblance to the Pauline "faith." The use, in two or three places during the discussion, of the Pauline formulas and very words,—a use which can hardly be without intention,—together with such a superficial apprehension of the teaching of the apostle, appears to indicate

that the writer had no sense for the mystical doctrine that he was opposing.

Was not Abraham our father justified by works (ii. 21)?—The writer here employs the very example adduced by Paul¹ with a contrary intention.

Thou seest that faith wrought with his works (ii. 22).—In his interpretation of this account the writer not only directly contradicts the apostle's conclusion, but reads into the declaration in Genesis a meaning which it does not contain, that is, that the *faith* of Abraham *wrought with his works*. His works were really the result of his faith.

Ye see that by works (ii. 24).—Here the writer himself resumes the discussion, and asserts a doctrine in pointed opposition to the Pauline teaching.

The statement that the writer resumes the discussion at verse 24 is, however, open to question. The section, vv. 18-24, is very obscure, and if another speaker is introduced at verse 18, whether an advocate of the Pauline doctrine or a "mediator," it is very difficult to determine where the words ascribed to him end. The "someone" (verse 18a) may be supposed to say, "You have faith and I have works," in the sense that it is not necessary that both be manifested, since the one presupposes the other. Then the writer may be assumed to answer (verse 18 b), "Show me your faith without your works, and I will show you my faith by my works." So long as the "someone" could not do this, he must acknowledge himself defeated in the argument. From this point of view the writer must be supposed to continue his refutation in verse 19 ff.

And in like manner was not also Rahab the harlot justified by works (ii. 25)?—The example of Rahab was probably taken from Heb. xi. 31 with such a variation as indicates a quotation from memory. The author of Hebrews, however, in adducing the example was not making an argument for justification by faith, and did not use "faith" in the Pauline sense. He represents Rahab as doing certain "works"

¹ Rom. iv. 2-4.

“by faith” quite in the manner of our author. Did the latter misapprehend him too?

The conclusion of the whole matter is that *as the body apart from the spirit is dead, even so faith apart from works is dead* (ii. 26)—a proposition to which no one using *faith* in the writer’s sense could object, but which is the opposite of the doctrine of Paul as to the relation of faith and works.

A warning is now declared against too much eagerness to become teachers, and against the unrestrained use of the tongue, together with remarks on wisdom (iii. 1-18).

Be not many teachers knowing that we shall receive heavier judgment (iii. 1).—Probably the freedom to speak allowed to everyone in the early church according to 1 Cor. xiv. 16-23 had led to abuses, so that there was need of restrictions upon too much teaching. The *heavier judgment* relates to the responsibility assumed by anyone who undertakes to teach.

For in many things we all stumble (iii. 2).—*For* introduces a reason for the remark regarding responsibility with an extension of the subject to *all*. *In many things*, that is, in respect to many things, should probably be limited by a reference to speech. In speaking, that is, in giving instruction in the religious assemblies, we all err in respect to many things.

If any stumbleth not in word, the same is a perfect man, able to bridle the whole body also (iii. 2).—This is the doctrine that self-control in one respect carries with it complete self-control—probably a half-truth.

Now if we put the horses’ bridles into their mouths we turn about the whole body also (iii. 3).—This is intended as an illustration of the doctrine of the preceding verse. The illustration limps, however, since the principle that a man who can control his tongue (mouth) is “a perfect man”

is not exemplified by the fact that a horse may be *turned about* by means of a bridle in its mouth.

The same is true of the illustration drawn from the rudder of a ship (iii. 4). Nothing is exemplified except the fact that a *little thing*, like the tongue, a bridle, or a rudder, may accomplish much.

This idea is carried forward in the declaration that *the tongue is a little member* and boasteth *great things*. *Behold how much wood is kindled by how small a fire* (iii. 5), literally, "how small a fire kindles how great a forest."

The writer now proceeds to an application of the figure suggested by the word "fire."

And the tongue is a fire; the world of iniquity among our members (iii. 6).—*The world of iniquity* means the totality of evil. The writer is evidently carried away by his zeal against the tongue, and furnishes an example of extravagant speech in attributing the sum total of badness to intemperate language. *Which defileth the whole body* is also an exaggeration.

And setteth on fire the wheel of nature (iii. 6).—The meaning of this expression is doubtful. The word rendered *nature* signifies primarily "origin," and by extension "that which follows origin," "life," is sometimes expressed by it according to good authorities. Perhaps "the wheel of life," life being regarded as in rotation, "the natural rotation of life," is a tolerably correct rendering of the words. The figure is too obscure to be elegant, and the translation, *wheel of nature*, renders it more extravagant than the words require it to be regarded.

For every kind of beasts and birds, of creeping things, and things in the sea, is tamed (iii. 7).—"Every nature of beasts" is the original, and the writer intends to contrast the two natures, that of man as exemplified in the tongue and that of beast.

But the tongue can no man tame (iii. 8).—This assertion can hardly be regarded as true, at least so far as the control of one's own tongue is concerned, and is shown to be false by many examples. The declaration that in general the tongue is untamable, and cannot be brought under subjection by discipline and Christian education is somewhat hazardous, and is certainly too pessimistic and extravagant to be accepted without question.

Full of deadly poison (iii. 8).—The figure of a serpent. Compare Ps. cxl. 3, "the poison of asps is under their lips."

The figures of the *fountain*, the *fig-tree*, etc. (iii. 11, 12) are intended to strengthen the declaration that *these things ought not so to be* (iii. 10).

Who is wise and understanding among you? let him show by his good life his works in meekness of wisdom (iii. 13).—The attempt to bring this verse into connection with the idea implied in the analogies of the "fountain," etc., is strained. The writer begins here a new theme. *Meekness of wisdom*, that is, a gentleness which flows from or is peculiar to *wisdom*. But *strife*, *jealousy*, and *faction* spring not from the *wisdom that is from above* (i. 5), but from its opposite (vv. 14, 15).

But the wisdom that is from above (iii. 17).—This is one of the "good gifts" of "the Father of lights" (i. 17). *Without variance*, that is, without dubiousness or uncertainty.

The fruit of righteousness is sown in peace for them that make peace (iii. 18).—This passage has caused no little perplexity to the commentators, and it must be conceded that the writer has not expressed himself with precision. Since *fruit* is not literally *sown*, the term may be taken in the so-called "pregnant" sense for the seed which produces the fruit. *Righteousness* is not "justification," but the moral quality of uprightness, and its *fruit* is the moral conduct appropriate to it.¹ The seed, of which the outcome is this conduct, is

¹ Gal. v. 22; Phil. i. 11; Heb. xii. 11.

sown in peace, which is emphatic in contrast with the "jealousy and faction" mentioned in verse 16. The sowing is not the act of God, but of the men themselves who *make peace*. Accordingly the translation, *for them that make peace*, is incorrect, and "by them," etc., should take its place. Perhaps the passage was suggested to the writer's mind by the "peaceable wisdom" of verse 17. Compare "peaceable fruit even the fruit of righteousness."¹

In immediate connection with the words in favour of peace, which conclude the preceding chapter, the writer proceeds to speak of discord among Christians and of the relation to it of evil desires, together with various matters of a practical character (iv. 1-17).

Whence come wars and fightings among you (iv. 1)?—This question appears to indicate that the writer had certain local conditions in mind, with which he was familiar. The character of the *fightings* cannot be determined from the text. They may have been over questions of doctrine or of property. By the form of the succeeding question the writer implies that they originated in the *pleasures* of his readers. *Pleasures* is probably used by metonymy for desires. Hence he continues :

Ye lust and have not, ye kill and covet, and cannot obtain (iv. 2).—The objects of the *lust* are left to be conjectured. *Have not*, that is, do not obtain. *Ye kill*. This is probably not to be understood as denoting the overt act of homicide. We have already seen that the writer is somewhat extravagant in his language (see 1 John iii. 15).

Ye have not, because ye ask not (iv. 2).—To *ask* here evidently means to pray for, according to verse 3, and the writer evidently believed in prayer for such things as the persons whom he had in view were contending (fighting) about. Yet in contradiction of the declaration that they do not ask, he goes on to say :

¹ Heb. xii. 11.

Ye ask, and receive not because ye ask amiss, that ye may spend it in your pleasures (iv. 3), that is, their prayer is a bad one, and is not answered because the purpose for which they ask is to *spend* whatever they may receive in answer to prayer *in pleasures*. It is evident that the writer had in mind praying for material possessions, that is, such possessions as might be spent in pleasures, and that he believed such things could be "received" in answer to prayer, if the purpose for which they were asked was good.

Ye adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God (iv. 4)?—*Adulteresses*. The feminine alone is used according to the most approved reading. But if it be allowed with nearly all commentators that the word is employed in a figurative sense¹ to denote faithlessness, worldliness, etc., the feminine form is explicable only on the supposition that not individuals, but churches are referred to.

A friend of the world is evidently not one who wishes to do good to *the world* (iv. 4), but one who is worldly minded, not spiritual, etc. *The world* is frequently used in the New Testament for "the whole mass of men alienated from God."²

Or think ye that the Scripture speaketh in vain, etc. (iv. 5)?—A citation from the Old Testament is naturally looked for in the words that follow, but no one has been able to find one in them. The passage quoted in verse 6 relates to another subject. The writer might have had in mind passages in the Old Testament which accord with the sentiment of verse 4, but omitted to quote any particular one.

Doth the spirit which He made to dwell in us long unto envying (iv. 5)?—This is capable of the rendering: "Doth He even to jealousy long for the spirit which He hath made to dwell in us?" Whether this was a current proverb which the writer took for a Scripture quotation, or is a passage from some apocryphal writing, or neither, its connection

¹ Matt. xii. 39, xvi. 4.

² John vii. 7; 1 Cor. i. 21, vi. 2; 2 Cor. vii. 10; Jas. i. 27; 1 Pet. v. 9.

with what precedes it is exceedingly obscure. A very obscure connection appears if we suppose the sense to be that if we are worldly God does not long for (love) *the spirit which He has made to dwell in us*, that is, our spirit, not the Holy Spirit, which is not recognised in the Epistle.

But He giveth more grace (iv. 6).—The thought is here also sadly wanting in clearness and precision. The meaning may possibly be that God gives *more grace* than if He did not love ("long for") us. *Wherefore the Scripture saith: God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble.* This citation is from Prov. iii. 34,¹ substantially according to the Septuagint. Connection with verse 4 may be established by supposing the writer to have thought the worldly to be proud.

Be subject, therefore, unto God; but resist the devil, and he will flee from you (iv. 7).—The former injunction may be regarded as addressed to the "proud." The second appears to indicate a dependence on 1 Pet. v. 8. *The devil* is the personal evil power who represents "the world" (verse 4)—"the prince of this world."²

Draw nigh to God (iv. 8).—See Heb. vii. 19. Fellowship with God and the divine support are made to depend on our attitude toward Him. *Double-minded* (iv. 8). See i. 8.

Be afflicted, and mourn, and weep (iv. 9).—"For godly sorrow worketh repentance."³ See also Luke xviii. 13.

Humble yourselves in the sight of the Lord (iv. 10).—This appears to indicate an acquaintance with Matt. xxiii. 12, or Luke xiv. 11, or at least with the saying of Jesus recorded in these places. See also 1 Pet. v. 6. In the apocryphal book of Sirach it is said, "They that fear the Lord will humble their souls before Him" (ii. 17).

Speaketh against the law and judgeth the law (iv. 11).—No connection with the foregoing is here discernible, and the writer appears to begin a new theme. *The law* is probably

¹ See 1 Pet. v. 5. ² John xii. 31, xiv. 30.

³ 2 Cor. vii. 10.

that referred to in i. 25 and ii. 9, the Christian law. He who *speaketh against another* may be said to condemn this law, to *judge* it, instead of being a *doer* of it.

Only one is the Lawgiver and Judge, even He who is able to save and destroy (iv. 12).—This appears to be a reminiscence of Matt. x. 28. *Who art thou that judgest?*¹

The writer now addresses himself to those who are absorbed in getting gain by means of trade (iv. 13-17).

Go to now, ye that say, To-day or to-morrow we will go into this city (iv. 13).—There is no reason for supposing that the writer had not in mind the rich members of the Christian communities which he was addressing. *Go to*. This expression, meaning "come now," is used here and in v. 1 only in the New Testament.² The condemnation here implied of the prosecution of a legitimate business for *gain*, there being no intimation that the business in question was carried on dishonestly, appears to have been written from the point of view of the opposition to riches and hostility to rich men, which is represented in other places in the Epistle. The condemnation is unqualified, and the question does not appear to have been considered whether a man might not *trade* and *get gain*, and still be righteous, God-fearing, and benevolent. If the rich men in question were base and selfish,³ these characteristics might well have been censured rather than the pursuit of riches in itself. The passage illustrates the one-sided way the writer had of looking at things (iii. 2-4).

Whereas ye know not what shall be on the morrow (iv. 14).—The fact, however, that we do not know what *the morrow* may bring forth is no reason why we should not honestly *get gain* to-day.

For that ye ought to say, If the Lord will (iv. 15).—If this verse has a logical connection with the foregoing it means

¹ Rom. xiv. 4.

² ἄγε νῦν.

³ Luke xii. 18-21.

that one ought not to say, "I will go into this city," etc., but, "If the Lord will, I will go." But the emphatic point in verses 13 and 14 is the condemnation of getting gain, and the writer can hardly have meant in view of verse 14 that getting gain is allowable, if one say one will trade if the Lord will, provided the Lord's will were ascertainable in every case. There seems to be a confusion of thought here. The formula, "If the Lord will," may convey an expression of piety, or may be only an empty form. Paul uses it in 1 Cor. iv. 19, but sometimes dispenses with it.¹

But now ye glory in your vauntings (iv. 16).—According to the connection this appears to mean nothing more than that the persons in view say they will go into this or that city and trade without saying, "If the Lord will."

To him, therefore, that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin (iv. 17).—If this verse is to be interpreted in connection with the foregoing, and not as an independent aphorism, it means that he who knows that he should say, "If the Lord will," and does not say it, commits a sin. As an independent aphorism it is an ethical commonplace.

The thought here (verse 17) is essentially that of Luke xii. 47, "that servant who knew his lord's will and prepared not himself neither did according to his will shall be beaten with many stripes." The relation of the two passages does not, however, indicate a literary dependence. The writer of the Epistle does not make any citations from the Gospels, and can hardly be said, indeed, to have been familiar with them, since he betrays their influence in only a slight degree if at all. The recommendation that in a case of sickness "the elders" be called upon, who will "pray over" the subject and "anoint him with oil in the name of the Lord" (v. 14), suggests Mark vi. 13 where healing by the disciples is mentioned in connection with anointing with oil. "A doer of the work" (i. 25) simply reminds us of Matt. vii. 21, 24, 26 and Luke vi. 47, 49, but there is nothing in the form of expression which denotes that the writer was acquainted with these sayings of Jesus, as is the case likewise with 1 Peter iii. 14, iv. 14, in

¹ Rom. xv. 28; 1 Cor. xvi. 5.

relation to expressions found in the Gospels. The occurrence of single words used in the synoptic Gospels proves nothing as to the writer's acquaintance with them or the influence of their vocabulary upon him, particularly since he neglects to quote words of Jesus in several instances in which such a citation would naturally be expected from one familiar with them. Most of the expressions which he does employ that are akin to sayings of Jesus belong to the aphoristic wisdom of the Jews from which Jesus himself largely drew. The slight interest shown by the writers of the Epistles in the events of the life of Jesus and in his teachings is noteworthy.

The Epistle closes with woes upon the rich and with exhortations as to patience, faith, and the healing of the rich by prayer (v. 1-20).

Go to now, ye rich, weep and howl for your miseries, etc. (v. 1).—The *rich* are warned of *miseries* which are to come upon them, but no discrimination is made between different kinds of rich men. All are visited with a sweeping condemnation, apparently because they are rich. What *miseries* the writer had in mind can only be conjectured. Perhaps he was thinking of "the last days," that is, the Parousia (verse 3), when the rich would, as he supposed, be visited with "eternal destruction from the face of the Lord."¹

Your riches are corrupted, and your garments are moth-eaten (v. 2).—These figures are a poetic exaggeration. *Eat your flesh as fire*. Compare Ps. xxi. 9.

Ye have laid up your treasure in the last days (v. 3), that is, in the days just preceding the second coming of Christ to judgment, when ye ought to have been thinking of other matters. Now very soon these riches will bear testimony against you in that judgment.

The dishonest actions and the oppressions of the rich are now specially mentioned as a reason for the condemnation of these people, but here again there is no discrimination (v. 4).

Moreover, they appear to have *lived delicately* and taken their *pleasure*, fattening themselves for *the day of slaughter*,

¹ 2 Thess. i. 8, 9, 10.

when the "vengeance"¹ of the Messianic judgment would fall upon them (v. 5). Compare Jer. xii. 3, xxv. 34.

Ye have condemned, ye have killed the righteous one (v. 6).—This is a charge against the rich of injustice or of procuring unjust decisions from the legal tribunals against *righteous* men, perhaps by influence or bribery or both. Probably *killed* is not to be understood literally.

Be patient, therefore, brethren, until the coming of the Lord (v. 7).—These consolatory words are addressed to the oppressed Christians. *Therefore*, that is, because the oppressive rich men will soon be punished, *the coming of the Lord* being at hand, when in the Messianic judgment justice will be done to all. An illustration of patience is drawn from the *husbandman*, who *waits for the precious fruit of the earth*. The blessedness of the Messianic kingdom would be the harvest of the true believers. Accordingly, they should *stablish their hearts*, for the Parousia was *at hand*.

Therefore they are admonished not to *murmur one against another*, the oppressed, probably, against the rich oppressor, lest they *be judged* (reminiscence of Matt. vii. 1). *The judge standeth before the doors* (v. 9). Let them not, then, think of executing vengeance themselves.²

The prophets are referred to as an example of patience which was especially shown in the case of *Job* (vv. 10, 11).

The end of the Lord (v. 10) is the end which He gave.

I saw the Lord is full of pity and merciful (v. 11).—God is frequently called *merciful* in the Old Testament, but in the New only here and in Luke vi. 36.

But above all things swear not (v. 12).—This verse is independent of connection with the context, and the writer evidently attached great importance to the prohibition which it contains, as *above all things* indicates. The passage bears a close relation to Matt. v. 34-37, but the deviations indicate rather a reminiscence than a quotation.

¹ 2 Thess. i. 8.

² Rom. xii. 19.

Is any among you suffering? let him pray, etc. (v. 13).—*Suffering* is probably used in a general sense, and does not relate to suffering from the oppression of the rich. *Let him sing praises*. See 1 Cor. xiv. 15, 26.

Is any among you sick? Let him call for the elders of the Church (v. 14).—*The elders of the Church* must be interpreted as the "presbyters" or the officials referred to in 1 Pet. v. 1-3. The language indicates that the writer had in mind not individuals of this class, but "the Presbytery," the college of presbyters.¹ Since these were to *pray over* the sick man and *anoint him with oil* it is evident that a miraculous healing power was supposed to reside in this official body. This circumstance has rightly been regarded as indicating the late origin of the Epistle, for in the earlier Church "healing" and "miracles" pertained to believers indiscriminately according to 1 Cor. xii. 9, 10.

Anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord (v. 14).—It is related in Mark vi. 13 that the apostles when sent out by Jesus "anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them." It is not probable, however, that the cure was attributed to the *anointing* in either case, which was rather a therapeutic or magical application made in accordance with Oriental usage. The whole process was doubtless analogous to the mind- and prayer-cures of modern times, although the writer is certain of the efficacy of the means employed.

The prayer of faith shall save him that is sick, and the Lord shall raise him up (v. 15).—*The prayer of faith* is the prayer which *faith* offers, or which is offered in *faith*. *Shall save him*, that is, will heal him.² *The Lord* is probably Christ, although the word is often used for "God" in this Epistle.

And if he have committed sins, it shall be forgiven him (v. 15).—Perhaps the *sins* that the writer had in mind were those which had caused his disease, though there is no intim-

¹ 1 Tim. iv. 14.

² Matt. ix. 21; Mark v. 23, "saved" or "made whole."

ation in the connection that any disease incurred without the subject's fault might not be treated in this way. It is not apparent in any case why the sins of the sick man should be *forgiven*, since his repentance is not intimated, and nothing is said about his having "faith." Yet confession of their sins *one to another* is strangely made a condition of the healing of the believers (v. 16). *The supplication of a righteous man availeth much*, and not alone for "wisdom" (i. 5), but for material advantages (iv. 3, v. 14, 15) according to the doctrine of the Epistle. Even rain may be obtained or prevented by prayer, as the case of Elijah proves, according to the writer's understanding of the matter. He shows himself, however, not well read in the Old Testament, for there is no account of Elijah's having prayed either that there should not be or that there should be rain.¹ There is also a deviation from the account in 1 Kings as to the length of time during which the drought continued. According to 1 Kgs. xviii. 1 Elijah announced "in the third year," that is, the third year of the reign of Ahab, that there would be rain, but this was not three years and six months from the time when he declared that there would be no rain "these years" (xvii. 1). The writer appears to have followed a tradition which was followed in Luke iv. 25.

If any among you do err from the truth, and one convert him (v. 19).—According to the following verse, *converteth a sinner from the error of his way*; the truth here doubtless means not "sound doctrine," but "practical truth."

Shall save a soul from death (v. 20), that is, from the death to which all but believers would be subject at the Parousia, "eternal destruction."²

And shall cover a multitude of sins (v. 20).—This probably proverbial expression³ does not appear to be appropriately employed in this connection.

¹ 1 Kgs. xvi. 1, xviii. 1, 41.

² 2 Thess. i. 7-9.

³ 1 Pet. iv. 8.

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER.

INTRODUCTION.

THIS Epistle is addressed to "the elect who are sojourners of the Dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia." Here, as in Jas. i. 1, "the Dispersion" suggests Jewish-Christian readers as the persons addressed. But the manifest references in the Epistle to antecedent circumstances and conditions of the readers, which imply that they were gentile Christians, renders this view untenable (i. 14, 18, ii. 9, 10, iv. 3, 4). In order to make the address accord with these indications several interpretations of the phrase "sojourners of the Dispersion" have been proposed, among the most probable of which is that it designated in the thought of the writer gentile Christians in accordance with iii. 6, where the Christian women are called daughters of Sarah, and with ii. 9, 10, v. 3, where the believers addressed are called "a holy nation," "the people of God," and "the flock,"¹ just as Paul designates Christendom as "the Israel of God,"² and the gentile Christians as "sons of Abraham."³ The writer evidently had before his mind believers who were in tribulation on account of persecutions which they had endured or with which they were threatened (ii. 12, iii. 16, iv. 4, 12, 13, v. 8, 9), and he wrote in order to encourage and strengthen them, "exhorting and testifying that this is the true grace of God; stand ye fast therein"

¹ Jer. xiii. 17.

² Gal. vi. 16.

³ *Ibid.* iii. 17.

(v. 12). Over against the sufferings which the Christians addressed were called upon to endure are placed a "living hope," an "inheritance incorruptible," and the salvation of their souls (i. 3, 4, 9). The introduction (i. 1-12) is occupied with these encouragements. There follow exhortations to holiness "in all manner of living" (i. 13-ii. 10); abstinence from "fleshly lusts," and subjections of various kinds (ii. 11-iii. 12); patient endurance in view of Christ's sufferings, etc. (iii. 13-iv. 6); soberness and pure love, etc. (iv. 7-19); and duties of elders and members of the Church (v. 1-11).

The relation of the Epistle to other New Testament writings is of importance with reference to the question of its date. A literary dependence upon Romans is almost universally conceded. Especially does the section of Romans including xii. 1-xiii. 14 furnish material which the writer of 1 Peter has in several passages reproduced. Weiss is the only scholar of note who maintains that Romans shows dependence on 1 Peter. The contacts with 1 Corinthians and Galatians show their priority in the influence of the Pauline thought and manner of expression, but not certainly a literary dependence of our Epistle upon them. The same is probably true of Hebrews and Ephesians. The influence of the synoptic Gospels upon the writer of the Epistle cannot be successfully disputed. It is probably prior to James, but the relation of the two writings is of such a character that no certain conclusion regarding it is likely to be reached. The fourth Gospel and the Epistles ascribed to John are undoubtedly later, but they show no literary dependence upon it.

The Epistle may be regarded as Pauline in the sense that many of the ideas of the apostle are represented in it, although they are modified, as in other later Epistles, in accordance with the general tendency of the post-apostolic age to soften their harder dogmatic character. The influ-

ence of Paul's style is so apparent as to indicate that the writer was a diligent student of his Epistles.

The fact that the form and thought of the Epistle are Pauline, that the apostle's ideas are not only presupposed, but also hospitably appropriated, stands unquestionably against the supposition that Peter was its author. There is little probability that Peter could have been so well-read in the Pauline literature as the author of the Epistle evidently was, and that he could so far have forgotten the fundamental ideas of Jesus' teaching as to give them little place in an Epistle to the churches—the conceptions of “the kingdom of God, Son of God, and Son of Man.” The man who was one of the “pillars” at Jerusalem in support of the law could hardly have written without reference to it. A personal companion of Jesus could not, as this writer does, omit reminiscences of the Master's life and words, and put faith and atonement in the Pauline sense in the place of the immediate relation of man to God represented as his teaching in the synoptic Gospels. The man who was “resisted” by Paul, and stood “condemned” before him with respect to a fundamental question of Christianity,¹ would not write an Epistle whose essential contents accuse him of being his disciple. A Jewish fisherman who as an apostle required an interpreter, according to Papias, could not write in a Greek style like that of this Epistle. The style shows no evidences of a translation from Aramaic into Greek, and the supposition that it was written by Mark or Silas after the dictation of Peter is totally unsupported. “By Silvanus” (v. 12) designates Silvanus as the bearer of the Epistle (to whom or to what church?) as a part of the fiction of its origin.

The opinion, defended by many eminent scholars and recently adopted by Ramsay,² that the persecutions to which the Epistle represents the Christians as exposed were probably, according to intimations contained in it, those instituted

¹ Gal. ii. 11-17. ² *The Church in the Roman Empire*, pp. 280 f.

by the Roman authorities and carried out by Pliny, has a strong probability in its favour. Persecution to the death appears to be implied in iv. 15, 16, and after question and trial in iii. 15, while it seems from v. 9 to have been general. "They suffer for the Name (iv. 14-16) pure and simple; the trial takes the form of an inquiry into their religion, giving them the opportunity of 'glorifying God in this Name.' " This was not the kind of persecution carried on in the reign of Nero. The circumstances implied in the Epistle fit the conditions of persecution which existed toward the end of the first century or the beginning of the second. That it was written, then, as late as the time of Trajan, that is, in the first decade of the second century, is not improbable, while a date earlier than the last quarter of the first century is untenable.

The Epistle purports to have been written from Babylon (v. 13), for "she that is in Babylon, elect," probably refers to the church in Babylon. This appellation is, however, in all probability intended for Rome, which might well receive the name in a time when persecutions of the Christians were ordered there, especially if we suppose the letter to have been written after the portions of Revelation in which the city is so designated.¹

Testimonies to the existence of the Epistle very early in the second century are doubtful. The second Epistle of Peter refers to it (iii. 1), and apparent contacts with one or two expressions contained in it are found in Clement of Rome, the Ignatian letters, and Barnabas. But these contacts are too doubtful to warrant the affirmation that the writers in question were acquainted with it. The common expressions may have been current in the religious language of the time, so that they may as reasonably be supposed to indicate the contemporaneous origin of the several writings as the use of one of them by the writers of another. The

¹ Rev. xiv. 8, xvi. 19, xvii. 5.

writer of *Hermas* is thought by Zahn to have been acquainted with the Epistle, but this scholar's argument is not conclusive. Eusebius found traces of a knowledge of it in Papias (about A.D. 140), and thought that Polycarp, who died after the middle of the second century, had read it. Neither he nor Justin Martyr, however, expressly quotes it. It is wanting in the canon of Muratori—a list of received New Testament books made by an unknown writer toward the end of the second century. It is accepted as a writing of Peter's by Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian, and Origen called it “an acknowledged Epistle.”

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER.

EXPOSITION.

In the introduction the readers are encouraged on the ground of their inheritance through Christ, salvation through whom was foretold by the prophets (i. 1-12).

Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ, to the elect who are sojourners, etc. (i. 1, 2).—On *sojourners of the Dispersion* see the Introduction. *Pontus*, etc. The provinces mentioned are those of Asia Minor. We have no knowledge of the spread of Christianity in Pontus, Kappadocia, and Bithynia during the first century. We know from a letter of Pliny's to Trajan that in the beginning of the second century it was somewhat extended in *Bithynia*. That an Epistle should have been written to these provinces about the middle of the first century by Peter is of course incredible. *Asia* probably includes some western provinces, Phrygia, etc. *According to the foreknowledge of God* is to be connected with *elect*. The writer regards the Christians as foreknown by God to be such, that is "elected" or foreordained.¹ This is a Pauline idea, but is not contained in the teaching of Jesus. The writer of this Epistle betrays here the influence of Paul, and shows by his departure from the original Christian tradition the improbability of the supposition that he was the apostle Peter.

¹ Rom. viii. 29.

Unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ (i. 2).—This like the two preceding clauses must be connected with *elect*. *The sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ* refers to the sprinkling of the people with the blood of the sacrifice on the occasion of the covenant-offering,¹ and signifies here that the *elect* were received into the covenant concluded by the shedding of *the blood of Christ*. The expression is not used by Paul, although the idea of redemption expressed is Pauline, and the conception belongs to the point of view distinctively represented by the Epistle to the Hebrews.² The presence of a Jewish element in Christian doctrine is to be noted here, which is happily foreign to the teaching of Jesus.

God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ (i. 3).—A Pauline phrase.³ *Begat us again unto a living hope*. The idea of the new birth. The word is used only in this Epistle (see verse 23).

Unto an inheritance, etc. (i. 4).—This denotes that to which the *living hope* looks forward. The *inheritance* designates the hoped-for blessedness of the Messianic kingdom, of which the believers were regarded as “heirs”⁴ who would soon enter upon their “eternal inheritance”⁵—an æonian inheritance, hence *incorruptible*. The early Christian writers generally did not think of the “reign” of Christ after his second coming as having an end, until he should deliver up the kingdom to God,⁶ after which its blessedness would continue, since God would be “all in all.” *Reserved in heaven*. See Col. i. 5. The kingdom was regarded as *in heaven*, because Christ was expected to descend thence.⁷

Guarded through faith (i. 5), that is, from apostasy, etc., in order that as believers they (the Christians addressed) might enter upon *the salvation ready to be revealed in the last time*, for only true believers could share in the blessedness of

¹ Ex. xxiv. 8. ² Heb. ix. 19, xii. 24. ³ Rom. xv. 6; 2 Cor. i. 3.

⁴ Gal. iv. 7. ⁵ Heb. ix. 15; Gal. iii. 18. ⁶ 1 Cor. xv. 24.

⁷ 1 Thess. iv. 16.

the Messianic kingdom. *Faith* is here employed absolutely, that is, without indication of an object, God or Christ, and is evidently regarded as the essential basis of the Christian life, while at the same time it is conceived as the means of salvation "at the appearing of Jesus Christ" (verse 7). The doctrine is more fully expressed in verse 21, where belief in God is declared to be "through" Christ, and is connected with His having raised Jesus from the dead.¹ This course of thought clearly indicates the writer's dependence on Paul, although the doctrine of "justification through faith" is not explicitly mentioned. Harnack correctly finds that in 1 Peter, as well as in Hebrews and the Pastoral Epistles, certain fundamental features of Paul's thought are reproduced according to the peculiar apprehension of the several writers. *The last time* is the time of the expected second coming of Christ, the Parousia, "the end of all things," which was conceived as "at hand" (iv. 7). The world-order of "the present age" would then be closed, come to its "end," and that of "the age to come," the Messianic age, would begin.

Put to grief in manifold temptations (i. 6).—*Temptations*, that is, trials by means of persecution. See Jas. i. 2; Acts xx. 19.

Might be found unto praise at the salvation of Jesus Christ (i. 7).—The persecutions have for their object the *proof* of the *faith* of the Christians, which will be shown at the Parousia, when Christ shall come as judge.

On whom, though now ye see him not, believing, ye rejoice receiving the end of your faith, the salvation of your souls (i. 8, 9).—This *salvation* is that of the Messianic kingdom, and so generally in the New Testament. *Not having seen*, 2 Cor. v. 7.

Concerning which salvation the prophets have inquired (i. 10).—In accordance with the general doctrine of the early

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 17.

Church the writer declares that the work of Christ was foretold by the prophets of the Old Testament. The idea that the preëxistent *spirit of Christ* inspired these prophets is expressed also in Heb. ii. 11-13, x. 5-9.

Testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glories (i. 11).—The passages are not indicated, but the writer could have found them in abundance by means of the allegorical interpretation employed in detail in Hebrews. *Glories* is Pauline.¹

By the Holy Ghost sent forth from heaven (i. 12).—Not only the apostles but the believers in general were thought in the early Church to receive *the Holy Ghost*.² Since it was regarded as the Spirit of God, it was conceived to be *sent forth from heaven*.

Which things angels desire to look into (i. 12).—The writer of Ephesians conceives the desire of the *angels* to have been gratified in this regard.³

The writer now proceeds to exhortations to a mode of life becoming such as have been born again (i. 13-ii. 10).

Wherefore, girding up the loins of your mind *set*
your hope perfectly in the grace that is to be brought to you at
the revelation of Jesus Christ (i. 13).—*Girding up*, etc., is a figure denoting spiritual preparation for the coming of Christ in his kingdom, or *the revelation of Jesus Christ*. The grace then to be looked for is the Messianic "salvation" or entrance into the kingdom. *The revelation of Christ* is a Pauline term for the Parousia or second personal coming.⁴

According to your former lusts (i. 14).—The writer evidently had in mind gentile Christians whose *ignorance* was that of those who knew not the true God.⁵

¹ 2 Cor. iii. 18, iv. 17; 1 Cor. xv. 43; Phil. iii. 21, iv. 19.

² Acts viii. 15, x. 44.

³ Eph. iv. 10, 11.

⁴ 1 Cor. i. 7; 2 Thess. i. 7.

⁵ Acts xvii. 30; Eph. iv. 18.

But like as He who called you (i. 15, 16).—See 1 Thess. ii. 12, iv. 7; 2 Tim. i. 9. *Ye shall be holy.* The passage quoted is found in Lev. xi. 44 and in other places. The idea that men should imitate the divine qualities belongs also to the teaching of Jesus.¹

Without respect of persons (i. 17).—See Acts x. 34; Rom. ii. 11; Eph. vi. 9; Col. iii. 25. *Judgeth according to each man's work.* See Rom. ii. 6; 2 Cor. v. 10.

Pass the time of your sojourning in fear (i. 17).—The *sojourning* is that of life in this world—a figurative use of the word. *Fear* is probably reverence for God, or it may be timidity in view of His judgment.² The sense is the same in ii. 8 and iii. 16.

Knowing that ye were redeemed, not with corruptible things from your vain manner of life but with precious blood, as of a lamb even the blood of Christ (i. 18, 19).—*Redeem* means to purchase or release by the payment of a ransom. This is the strictly Pauline sense of the term, most explicitly expressed in Gal. iii. 13, where Paul represents Christ as having “bought us off from the curse of the law” by having “become a curse for us,” that is, by having borne its penalty for us, purchased us with his blood. The manner of bearing it, that is, “on the tree,” is indicated. While the idea here expressed is Pauline, the manner of expressing it is not, since not redemption from “the curse of the law,” from penalty, is prominent, as in Paul’s construction, but a remote result, deliverance from a *vain manner of life*, is emphasised. This is the weakened Paulinism of the later Epistles.³ *Lamb*, etc. See Is. iii. 7; John i. 29. The words *without blemish*, etc., appear to indicate that the writer had in mind the idea of *sacrifice* in accordance with Levit. xxii. 20, 21, and intended to be understood as teaching that *the precious blood* of Christ possessed redeeming efficacy, because it was that of a blameless sacrificial

¹ Matt. v. 48; Luke vi. 36.

² 2 Cor. v. ii.

³ See Tit. ii. 14.

victim. The question, however, whether in this Epistle, as well as in the Pauline doctrine, the idea of sacrifice is connected with that of redemption must remain undecided. The "once," iii. 18, appears to indicate, after the analogy of Heb. ix. 26-28, a single sacrifice made in place of the frequent offerings prescribed in the Hebrew ritual.¹ The most eminent expositors disagree on this point.

Who was foreknown, indeed, before the foundation of the world, but was manifested at the end of the times (i. 20).—The preëxistence of Christ is probably implied here, as in verse 11 it is explicitly declared that he was in the prophets, and testified beforehand his sufferings and his subsequent glory through them. His manifestation "in these last times" implies a previous unmanifested existence, as in 1 Tim. iii. 6; Heb. ix. 26. The divine predetermination of the redemption of men through Christ was a current doctrine in the early Church.² The idea that the believers were "chosen in him" is expressed in Eph. i. 4. The former predestination was probably regarded as including the latter. *At the end of the times*, that is, the end of the pre-Messianic age.

Which raised him from the dead so that your faith and hope might be in God (i. 21).—The last clause is capable of the rendering, "so that your faith might be also hope in God." Compare 1 Cor. xv. 14. This connection of the resurrection of Christ with Christian faith and hope is distinctively Pauline.

Love one another, etc. (i. 22).—The essence of practical Christianity.

Having been begotten again, etc. (i. 23).—In this conception the writer is more in contact with the fourth Gospel and the Johannine Epistles than with Paul.³

¹ See Rom. vi. 10.

² Rom. xvi. 25, 26; 2 Tim. i. 10; Tit. i. 3; John xvii. 24.

³ John i. 13, iii. 3, 5, 6, 8; 1 John iii. 9, iv. 7, v. 1, 4, 18.

Not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible (i. 23).—The latter is the Holy Spirit. Compare “His [God’s] seed abideth in him,” 1 John iii. 9.

Through the word of God, which liveth and abideth (i. 24).—This may be grammatically rendered, “Through the word of the living and abiding God,” but in favour of the other rendering is the citation from Is. xl. 6, 7.

Putting away, therefore, all wickedness and all guile and hypocrisies (ii. 1, 2, 3).—The connection indicated by *therefore* is with the idea of the new birth in the foregoing. Since you are born anew, you ought to put away, etc., and, *as newborn babes, long for the spiritual milk.*¹ *Spiritual* is a misleading translation of a word which means “reasonable,” “rational,” in this connection, probably that which is nourishing to the mind. *Without guile* is too literal a rendering, and “pure” were a much better translation of the Greek word. *If ye have tasted.* See Heb. vi. 4.

Unto whom coming, a living stone (ii. 4).—The figure of a stone applied to Jesus is employed in Rom. ix. 33; Matt. xxi. 42; Acts iv. 11. The application of the epithet *living* is obscure, and has the appearance of a mixing of metaphors.

Ye also as living stones are built up a spiritual house (ii. 5).—The idea of Christ as a stone, elect, precious, probably a corner-stone (see the quotation, verse 6), suggested to the writer the figure of a temple, the walls of which should be composed of believers. The figure may have been derived from 1 Cor. iii. 16. The transition is rather abrupt from “newborn babes” longing for reasonable milk to “living stones” in “a spiritual house.”

To be a holy priesthood (ii. 5).—It is difficult to rid oneself of the impression of an incongruity and infelicity, if not a confusion, of thought in this connection of *stones* as part of a *house* and a *priesthood* offering *sacrifices*.

Because it is contained in Scripture (ii. 6).—The quotation

¹ 1 Cor. iii. 2.

is from Is. xxviii. 16 according to the Septuagint, somewhat abbreviated. The verse in the original Hebrew concludes with, "he that believeth shall not flee," or "make haste." It relates to Jerusalem, which is said to stand fast and not to be in danger from the Assyrian. The reference of the passage to Christ is wholly unwarranted as an interpretation of it according to the thought of the prophet.

This corner-stone, Christ, is precious to the believers (ii. 7), but to the unbelievers *a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence* (ii. 8).—See Is. viii. 14. The preceding citation from Ps. cxviii. 22 does not seem appropriate to unbelievers.

Wherunto also they were appointed (ii. 8).—As believers were thought by Paul to have been "*appointed* unto the obtaining of salvation,"¹ so there was also a divine predestination of unbelievers.² Whether or no this be regarded as Paul's essential teaching according to the analogy of his thought, it left its impress upon succeeding writers, and is manifestly expressed here.

But ye are an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation (ii. 9, 10).—Epithets applied in the Old Testament to the Jews are here employed of the Christians.³ See i. 1 and the Introduction. See "a people for His own possession."⁴ *Into His marvellous light*, that is, God's, for to God the "calling" of believers is generally attributed.⁵ *Darkness* is a figure for the condition of the gentiles prior to their conversion.

The Christians are exhorted to abstain from fleshly lusts, and submission is recommended to slaves and wives (ii. 11 iii. 12).

As sojourners and pilgrims (ii. 11).—The sojourn and pilgrimage are figures for the earthly life, the life in "the present age." *Fleshly lusts*. See Gal. v. 17. *Soul*, "the

¹ 1 Thess. v. 9; Rom. viii. 29.

² Rom. ix. 18.

³ Isa. xliii. 21; Ex. xix. 6, LXX.

⁴ Tit. ii. 14.

⁵ Col. i. 13.

spiritual substance of man ” as opposed to the body, not “ life ” here.

Among the gentiles (ii. 12).—The exhortation is addressed to gentile Christians as contrasted with unconverted gentiles. *The day of visitation*, that is, the *visitation* of God—an expression which may refer to the divine judgment or to a dealing with those visited which effects, or is intended to effect, their salvation.¹ The latter is probably the sense here.

Be subject to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, whether it be to the king as supreme, etc. (ii. 13, 14).—The word translated *ordinance* is the one commonly signifying “ creation ” or “ creature,” and is not used in the sense in which it is here employed elsewhere in the New Testament. As something that man has created or established, a human institution, it is here properly rendered *ordinance*. *The king* is the Roman emperor. *For the Lord's sake*, is for Christ's sake, or because it is his will.

As free (ii. 16).—Probably in the Pauline sense.² The *bondservant of God* is the true freeman.

Honour all men (ii. 17).—This does not mean “ be subject to all men,” but accord to all men the honour which belongs to them, that is, no more than that which is due them as men. *Fear God*. See note on i. 17.

Servants, be in subjection (ii. 18).—See notes on Eph. vi. 51 ; Col. iii. 22 f. ; Tit. ii. 9 f. *The froward*, the unfair, perverse. See Phil. ii. 15.

For this is acceptable (ii. 19).—Literally “ this is grace.” See v. 20, where “ with God ” is supplied. The meaning is, *acceptable* to God. *For conscience toward God*. This has had various interpretations, “ God's knowledge of us,” “ God's knowledge with us ” (co-knowledge), “ conscientiousness before God,” and “ the consciousness of God,” carrying a sense of obligation. The last two are not far apart, and

¹ Job. x. 12 ; Luke xix. 44.

² Gal. v. 13.

either of them may be taken as a correct rendering of the words.

For hereunto were ye called (ii. 21).—The Christian calling, the state of being *called* as Christians, is regarded as requiring the patient endurance of wrong and hardship, because *Christ also suffered as an example.*¹ This is the practical rather than the dogmatic view of Christ's sufferings—a word which must be regarded as relating not to his passion on the cross, but to all that he endured during his life, as is apparent from v. 23, *when he was reviled, reviled not again*, etc.

Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth (ii. 22).—This is from Isa. liii. 9 according to the Septuagint, and is there said of the “servant of Jehovah,” the pious remnant of the people of the exile.

Who his own self bare our sins in his body upon the tree (ii. 24).—In Isa. liii. 12 according to the Septuagint it is said of the subject previously mentioned, “he himself bare the sins of many.” The Jewish doctrine of atonement, according to which the sufferings of one may release another or others from guilt and penalty with reference to the law, is here expressed. This is also Paul's doctrine, who taught that Christ “bought us off” “from the curse [penalty] of the law” by himself becoming a curse for us.²

To bear our sins in his body upon the tree (ii. 24) can have no other meaning than to suffer the penalty of our sins in his crucifixion, and so free us from it, so that *we, having died unto sins, might live unto righteousness*. This passage implies the writer's dependence upon the Pauline thought and phraseology.³

By whose stripes ye were healed (ii. 24).—This is from Isa. liii. 5 according to the Septuagint. See note on verse 22.

But are now returned unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls (ii. 25).—The figure was perhaps derived from

¹ John xiii. 15.

² Gal. iii. 13.

³ Rom. vi. 2.

Ezek. xxxiv. 11, 12, 16, but *the Shepherd* is probably Christ. See v. 4.

In like manner (that is, as the slaves, ii. 18), *ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands* (iii. 1, 2).—This injunction is intended for all the Christian women among the people addressed, but especially to those whose husbands were unbelievers, and did not *obey the word*. The end in view is that the latter might be gained to the Christian cause by the chastity and *fear* of their wives. See Col. iii. 18 ; Eph. v. 22-24 ; 1 Tim. ii. 9 and the notes on the passages.

The hidden man of the heart (iii. 4).—See Paul's "inward man." ¹

For after this manner *the holy women* (iii. 5, 6).—The prominence given to the idea of woman's *subjection* is noteworthy. The writer treats the subject like an enlightened man of his age who is unable to transcend its point of view.

Ye husbands, in like manner (iii. 7).—"In like manner" probably relates vaguely to the similarity of the relation between exhortations to husbands and to wives.

According to knowledge. This is probably to be taken adverbially in the sense of "with insight," that is, with understanding of what belongs to the relation of husband and wife. It were probably a preferable translation to omit the words *your wives* which have been supplied, and read, "dwell according to knowledge with the woman as the weaker vessel, giving honour to her as both being heirs," etc.

Finally, be ye all likeminded (iii. 8, 9).—Compare Rom. xii. 13-17 ; 1 Thess. v. 15 ; 1 Cor. iv. 12 ; Luke vi. 28 ; Heb. xii. 17 ("without a blessing"). The citation (vv. 10-12) is from Ps. xxxiv. 13-17 according to the Septuagint.

Exhortations follow to patience under persecution in view of Christ's sufferings. Mention is made of the preaching to the spirits in prison, and soberness and pure love are recommended (iii. 13-iv. 19).

¹ Rom. vii. 22 ; 2 Cor. iv. 16.

For righteousness' sake (iii. 14).—This passage appears to have been suggested by the beatitude, Matt. v. 10. *Fear not their fear (iii. 14).* Apparently from Isa. viii. 12, 13. Here the meaning is, "fear not the fear which proceeds from them."

But sanctify in your hearts Christ as Lord [that is, reverence him hold him as honoured], *being ready always to give an answer (iii. 15).*—When questioned before the Roman judicial tribunals as to your *hope*, that is, your Christian faith, which includes the *hope* that is to become fruition at the Parousia, be ready to answer.

Because Christ also suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous, that he might bring us to God (iii. 18).—Since Christ was *righteous*, his suffering was not for his own sins, but for the sins of men, that is, he made atonement for them or ransomed men from bondage to them. The Pauline idea of the relation of Christ's suffering to the law is not fully carried out here, but the emphasis is placed on the result of the atonement in the words, *that he might bring us to God. Once.* See Heb. ix. 26, 28. The connection does not indicate that the writer had the thought of Hebrews in mind.

Being put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the spirit (iii. 18).—The expression, *quickened in the spirit*, means made alive, or raised from the dead (verse 21).¹ This entire verse is manifestly a reproduction of the Pauline teaching on the subject. The suffering of Christ *for sins* accords with "gave himself for our sins" (Gal. i. 4) and "died for our sins" (1 Cor. xv. 3). We have here, too, the well-known Pauline antithesis of "flesh" and "spirit." The Pauline doctrine of the spirit also appears in i. 2, 12, iv. 14. *In which also he went and preached to the spirits in prison (iii. 19).*—Not as essential to his argument, but as if expressing incidentally a current belief which was suggested to him by the word "spirit," the writer here inserts (for verse 18 would make

¹ Rom. viii. 11; 1 Cor. xv. 22.

a good connection with verse 22) a tradition that Jesus went into the underworld *in the spirit*, that is, after having laid aside the flesh, and *preached to the spirits*.

Who were aforetime disobedient in the days of Noah (iii. 20). —In which he went, etc., literally “in which [spirit] having gone, he preached,” etc. These words unquestionably imply that the writer thought of a personal going of Christ to *preach to the spirits in prison*, just as “having gone into heaven” (verse 22) admits of no other interpretation. A preaching through Noah to the contemporaries of the latter, as some interpret the words, is accordingly excluded. Besides, if this latter view be adopted, *in prison* has no intelligible sense, since to say that the spirits were *in prison* because they would not listen to Noah is to strain a figure too much, to say nothing of the unfitness of calling the living men of that time *spirits*. “Spirit” (πνεῦμα) is sometimes used in the New Testament to designate men who have departed this life.¹ *Prison* denotes the place where *the spirits* of the *disobedient* were confined, that part of the underworld or realm of the dead assigned to bad men.² To this place, then, Jesus was believed to have gone *in spirit* to preach *to the spirits* of the men who had been disobedient *when the ark was preparing*, for *when* must be connected with *disobedient*. As to the time when Christ was supposed to have gone *in spirit* to *preach to the spirits in prison*, it is arbitrary to suppose that the writer had in mind any period prior to Jesus’ coming in the flesh, since he is here speaking of the passion and resurrection. The time was probably thought to be between his death and his resurrection. The preaching of Christ in question was doubtless conceived to have been similar to that in which he was engaged during his earthly ministry, that is, a preaching of repentance, and it is arbitrary to suppose that he was thought to have gone to

¹ Acts xxiii. 9; Luke xxiv. 37, 39; Heb. xii. 23.

² Rev. xx. 7; 2 Pet. ii. 4; Jude 6.

these *spirits in prison* to announce to them their condemnation, which their imprisonment must be assumed to have already made known to them.

This tradition of obscure origin has only an historical importance. It shows that prior to and at the time of the composition of this Epistle it was believed among some Christians that the *disobedient spirits in prison* of the Noachian time were not in a hopeless condition. If the passage be regarded as having doctrinal significance, it must be taken with the qualification that, strictly interpreted, it applies only to the spirits of the people who lived *when the ark was preparing*. Why in the formation of the tradition this limitation was put upon the preaching of Jesus to the departed must remain a mystery. It is evident that with this restriction the doctrinal importance of the passage practically disappears. The preaching of repentance to a small fraction of the disobedient departed spirits in a mythological underworld is not a matter of great significance in a system of dogmatic theology.

A few . . . were saved through water (iii. 20).—Since the *eight* souls were saved *through* the ark as instrument or means, *through* cannot be taken in connection with *water* as instrumental. Yet this idea seems to have been in the writer's mind, since he says the water does *now save* the Christians by means of baptism.

The flood seems to be regarded as a type of baptism *after a true likeness* (iii. 21), but the writer's figure limps. *The interrogation of a good conscience*. The word rendered "interrogation" means sometimes "an earnest seeking," and the idea is that baptism saves because its subjects have earnestly sought a good conscience toward God, or "a conscience reconciled to God." The Pauline idea is added that the subjects in question are saved *through the resurrection of Jesus Christ*.

Who is on the right hand of God (iii. 22).—See Rom. viii. 22; Col. iii. 1. Here his sway extends over all the heavenly powers, which are here named as to their ranks in accordance with the Jewish mythology. See the different names and

arrangements of the classes of angelic beings in Rom. viii. 38; Col. i. 16; Eph. i. 21.

Forasmuch, then, as Christ suffered in the flesh, etc. (iv. 1).—The believers are exhorted to imitate the Master in not shrinking from suffering *in the flesh* from persecutions, *for he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin*, that is, one who suffers on account of opposition to sin, has carried his opposition to it to the point of suffering for it, has in fact broken the power of sin in his life. *To the lusts of men (iv. 2).* See the same construction as “to righteousness” (ii. 24).

For the time past may suffice, etc. (iv. 3).—*The past time* of their life, when they walked in lasciviousness, etc., was sufficient to devote to the satisfaction of such desires as pertain to the gentiles, who live “after the flesh.”

Who shall give account to him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead (iv. 5).—This judge is Christ, see Acts x. 42; 2 Tim. iv. 1, who is “on the right hand of God” (iii. 22). When he should come in glory it would be “to judgment.” The judgment at the Parousia is conceived by this writer as about to be passed upon the living and the dead, those who would be living at the time of Christ’s second coming and those who had died prior to that event. Probably so far as *the dead* are concerned believers only are included in the writer’s thought, just as the Pauline doctrine of the last things takes account of them alone. The believers were conceived as subject to judgment.¹

For to this end was the gospel preached even to the dead (iv. 6).—The *end* is that *the dead* might be judged as men, but might live *to God in the spirit*. It is evident that none of *the dead* are included except those to whom the gospel had been preached. Accordingly, they must be supposed to be either those of the time of Noah mentioned in iii. 19, or the dead who had been “evangelised” prior to their death.

¹ 2 Cor. v. 10.

The resurrection and judgment of all the dead at the Parousia is not expressed here, as it does not certainly appear to have been the teaching of Paul, judged by his Epistles, although intimations of such a belief are not wanting in some New Testament writers.¹

But the end of all things is at hand (iv. 7), that is, the end of the existing world-order, the pre-Messianic age, when the judge, Christ, would appear.

It is evident that from this point of view the writer could not have thought of a universal preaching of the gospel. But on that hypothesis all who should be dead at the coming of Christ would not have heard it, so that they could be included in the judgment; and of the innumerable multitude of those who had not heard the message while living only those of the time of Noah are by implication favoured according to iii. 19. The materials for a system of theology here supplied are therefore very meagre.

Be ye therefore of sound mind for love covereth a multitude of sins (iv. 7-8).—*Therefore*, that is, because the coming of Christ, the judge, is *at hand*. *Of sound mind*. The Greek word implies the exercise of moderation of mind, self-control. *Sober unto prayer*, that is, in a state of mind suitable to *prayer*. In accordance with the essence of Christ's teaching the writer exhorts his readers to love one another, and adds the proverbial expression, *love covereth a multitude of sins*, adopted from Prov. x. 12. The reference is to the covering of one another's sins, putting them out of sight, by a spirit of forgiveness. The relation of this practical exhortation to the idea of the approaching "end of all things" is somewhat obscure. There is no sufficient reason for regarding these words as one of the sayings of Jesus not recorded in the Gospels. It is quoted in the *Didaskalia* with the words, "the Lord says," but Mr. Ropes calls attention to the fact that the writer also quotes Prov. xv. 1 with the same formula, and thinks, in opposition to Dr. Resch, that

¹ Acts xxiv. 15; John v. 24; Rev. xx. 5.

the false reference of the passage to Jesus is "easily intelligible." See Jas. v. 20, "hide a multitude of sins," and compare Ps. xxxii. 1, lxxxv. 2.

Using hospitality (iv. 9).—See Rom. xii. 13; Heb. xiii. 2.

According as each hath received a gift (iv. 10).—A gift, a charism. See Rom. xii. 6; 1 Cor. xii. 4, 28. A dependence of the writer on these Pauline passages is evident.

Speaking as it were the oracles of God (iv. 11).—This is probably said with reference to the function of "prophet," or teacher, or preacher.¹ He who performs this function should not speak his own thoughts, but the oracles (*logia*) of God, that is, the words of the Old Testament—the only writing recognised as "inspired" among Christians at the time when this Epistle was written.

If any man ministereth, ministering as of the strength which God supplieth (iv. 11).—See Rom. xii. 7. Those who performed the official function of ministers or deacons, the same that is called "helps" in 1 Cor. xii. 28, should not serve in reliance on their own power, but on *the strength which God supplieth*. *Whose is the glory*, etc. This doxology may refer grammatically either to God or to Christ. The former is probably the correct reference here, though according to i. 21, the writer might consistently have had Christ in view. Doxologies to Christ are not wanting in the later writings of the New Testament.²

Brethren, think it not strange concerning the fiery trial, etc. (iv. 12).—This is said with reference to the persecutions which the Christians addressed were suffering (see the Introduction). These come to *prove* them, but they should *rejoice*, since they endure such sufferings as Christ endured, that *at the revelation of his glory*, that is, at the Parousia, they *may rejoice with exceeding joy (iv. 13)*.

For the name of Christ (iv. 14).—This expression is not

¹ Rom. xii. 6.

² Heb. xiii. 21; 2 Tim. iv. 18 (probably); 2 Pet. iii. 18; Rev. i. 6.

used elsewhere in the New Testament. On persecution for *the Name*, see the Introduction.

The Spirit of glory and the Spirit of God resteth upon you (iv. 14).—They are made partakers of the Spirit of God which is a *Spirit of glory*, that is, its “ministration” will be *glory* to be realised at the coming of Christ.¹

For let none of you suffer as a murderer but if a man suffer as a Christian let him not be ashamed (iv. 15, 16).—No one could *suffer as a murderer*, etc., without arraignment before the Roman tribunals, and the suffering *as a Christian* here implies such an arraignment as fits the inquiry (iii. 15) which Pliny was ordered to conduct.

For the time is come for judgment to begin (iv. 17).—This judgment is that of “the end of all things” (v. 7). *The house of God* is the community of Christians. The judgment of the Parousia was conceived to be about to begin with them, and the writer expresses doubt as to the fate of the unbelievers, *the ungodly and sinner* (Prov. xi. 31), since *the righteous are scarcely saved* (iv. 18). See 2 Thess. i. 8, 9.

Those who *suffer according to the will of God* (iii. 17) may *commit their souls in well-doing unto a faithful Creator* (iv. 19).—God is not elsewhere designated *Creator* in the New Testament.

The Epistle ends with exhortations to elders, to submission on the part of the younger, to constancy in faith, and to resistance to the devil (v. 1-14).

The elders, therefore, among you I exhort who am a fellow-elder and a witness of the sufferings of Christ (v. 1).—The elders were overseers of the churches, and are not in the New Testament distinguished from bishops.² *Fellow-elder*. If we suppose the writer consciously to act the part of Peter here, he represents the apostle as a *fellow-elder* in some unreal sense, such as that an apostle having oversight might

¹ 2 Cor. iii. 8.

² 1 Tim. v. 17, 19; Tit. i. 5; Jas. v. 14.

call himself an elder. This may have been his point of view, or he may have forgotten his *rôle* and called himself what perhaps he was in fact an elder or presbyter of the church.

Witness of the sufferings of Christ (v. 1).—According to iv. 13 *the sufferings of Christ* may be the afflictions which fell upon believers in persecution. A *witness* of these may be one who bears testimony by his own fidelity in persecution, a martyr. This interpretation seems required by the fact that the article unites the two nouns in a single conception, *the fellow-elder and witness of the sufferings of Christ*, not “a fellow-elder and a witness,” etc. But if *witness* be understood to mean eye-witness and *the sufferings of Christ* those which he personally endured, the passage is a part of the fiction of authorship.

Also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed (v. 1).—*The glory* in question is that of the Parousia, when Christ was expected to come in a surprising pomp and magnificence to set up the Messianic kingdom (iv. 13 ; Jude 24). The writer expects to share in that *glory*. *Tend the flock of God*, etc. (v. 2). The figure of a *flock* and shepherd passed from the Old Testament into the New.¹ See Luke xii. 32. *Not of constraint*. See Heb. xiii. 17. *Nor yet for filthy lucre*. See Acts xx. 33 ; Tit. i. 7, 11.

And when the chief Shepherd² shall be manifested, that is, at the Parousia, *ye shall receive the crown of glory that fadeth not away* (v. 4).—The unfading *crown* is the *glory* itself. See “crown of righteousness,” 2 Tim. iv. 8 ; “crown of life,” Jas. i. 12 and Rev. ii. 10. At the Parousia Christ was expected to have a “body of glory”³ to which the bodies of the believers would be “conformed,” for those of them who had died would be raised “incorruptible” and those living would be “changed,”⁴ and both classes would “bear

¹ Jer. xxiii. 1-4 ; Ezek. xxxiv. 2.

³ Phil. iii. 21.

² Heb. xiii. 20.

⁴ 1 Cor. xv. 52.

the image of the heavenly " ¹—the heavenly, glorious body of Christ.

Yea, all of you gird yourselves with humility to serve one another (v. 5).—The word rendered *gird yourselves* means "to fasten anything by means of a knot," hence "to clothe," or "fasten on a garment." Clothe yourselves with humility so as to be in a disposition to serve one another, is the sense of the passage.² The writer seeks to strengthen this teaching by a citation from Prov. iii. 34 according to the Septuagint with "God" for "Lord."³

Humble yourselves, therefore, under the mighty hand of God, that He may exalt you in due time (v. 6).—*Mighty hand*. See Deut. iii. 24. On humility and exaltation see Matt. xxiii. 12; Luke xiv. 11; Jas. iv. 10.

This verse has the appearance of having its origin in a reminiscence of some passages in the Gospels, particularly Matt. xxiii. 12, Luke xiv. 11. The writer's relation to the Gospel-history is neither that of close familiarity nor that of marked contact. The influence of expressions in the earlier literature can hardly be affirmed on the strength of such resemblances as "gird up the loins of your mind" (i. 13) compared with Luke xii. 35, "let your loins be girded about"; of "watch" or "be watchful" (v. 8), cf. Matt. xxiv. 42 and Luke xxi. 36; of "the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven" (i. 12), cf. Luke xxiv. 49. "The stone which the builders rejected" (ii. 7) has accords with Luke xx. 17 f., and Rom. ix. 33, but was not improbably a current phrase. Reminiscence may account for i. 10, cf. Luke x. 24, for i. 6-9, ii. 12, iii. 16, cf. Luke vi. 32 f., and for i. 11, cf. Luke xxiv. 26.

Casting all your anxiety upon Him, etc. (v. 7).—From Ps. lv. 22, substantially according to the Septuagint.

Your adversary, the devil, as a roaring lion (v. 8).—Spiritual sobriety and watchfulness are enjoined because the *adversary* of the believers, the personal power of evil, the devil, *walketh about like a roaring lion* hungry for his prey,

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 49.

² Rom. xii. 16; Eph. iv. 2; Phil. ii. 3.

³ Jas. iv. 6.

seeking whom he may devour. Perhaps the special form of temptation from *the devil* which the writer had in mind was that connected with the persecutions already referred to and again indicated in verse 9.

Whom withstand (v. 9).—See Jas. iv. 7. *The same sufferings, etc.*, implies a general persecution. See the Introduction.

Who called you unto His eternal glory in Christ (v. 10).—*In Christ* should be joined with *called*. Being *called* into fellowship with Christ, the believers are *called* to the *eternal glory* of God, that of which He is the Author, and which will be manifested at the coming of the Messianic kingdom. This is also called “the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ.”

Shall Himself perfect, stablish, strengthen you (v. 10).—God is conceived as directly acting upon the Christians to this end.

To whom be the dominion (v. 11).—The doxology is ascribed to God.

By Silvanus, our faithful brother, as I account him, I have written unto you briefly (v. 12).—Silvanus, so called by Paul, Silas, in Acts. He is here designated as the bearer of the Epistle. (See “by them,” Acts xv. 23.)

The mention of this person, who is known to Acts and some of the Pauline Epistles,¹ belongs to the fiction of the authorship. *As I account him* refers to *faithful*.

That this is the true grace of God (v. 12).—To set this forth and impress it upon the readers was the main object of the Epistle. Hence the final exhortation, *stand ye fast therein*.

She that is in Babylon, elect together with you, saluteth you (v. 13).—The interpretation of this passage to the effect that the words, “the elect one [fem.] in Babylon,” refer to the wife of Peter or to some other Christian woman, has not found any considerable support. The majority of expositors understand them to refer to the church in Babylon, and the

¹ Acts xv. 22; 2 Cor. i. 19; 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1.

word "church" appears in the Sinaitic manuscript. Since, however, there is no known tradition connecting Peter with Babylon, it is not easy to explain why a writer assuming the name of the apostle should have represented the Epistle to have been written in that city. It is probable that Babylon is used for Rome according to Rev. xiv. 8, xviii. 2, 10. Such was the opinion of Papias, according to Eusebius, in which he has been followed by Clement of Alexandria, Jerome, and many recent expositors. The salutation from *Mark* is added in accordance with the part which the writer had assumed, since tradition connects him with Peter as an "interpreter."

Salute one another with a kiss of love.—Peace be unto you all that are in Christ.

THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER.

INTRODUCTION.

LIKE the so-called first Epistle of Peter this purports to have been written by that apostle, although here the name "Simon" is prefixed, and the writer is suspiciously anxious to make the apostolic authorship prominent (i. 1, 14, 16-18, iii. 1, 15). The address is more vague than that of the other, being to "them that have obtained a like precious faith with us," etc. Yet the readers so indefinitely indicated are strangely assumed in iii. 1 to be the same as those addressed in 1 Peter. They are represented, besides, as having formerly been instructed by Peter and to have received a letter or letters from Paul, whom the writer calls "our beloved brother" (iii. 15). Such a combination is more likely to have had its origin in the imagination of a time when a tendency prevailed to bring the followers of these two leaders into union in one Catholic Church, than to have historically existed. It has not extravagantly been characterised as "an impossibility in history."

The object of the Epistle is clearly manifest on a glance at its contents. After a brief introduction (i. 1-4), follow some general exhortations to the practice of Christian virtues, in order that the readers may make their "calling and election sure" (i. 5-11). The design of the writing is then immediately made evident by a reference to the "power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ" (i. 16), as an evidence of

the credibility of which a reference to the transfiguration is introduced (i. 17, 18). A reference to prophecy is thereafter made (i. 19-21), and in contrast with the true prophets the Gnostic false teachers are described and condemned (ii. 1-22). In opposition to the "mockers" of "the last days," who scoff at the deferred Parousia, the writer makes emphatic the certainty of its coming with the dissolution of "the heavens" and the melting of "the elements" with "fervent heat" (iii. 1-13). The Epistle ends with admonitions appropriate to this dread certainty of the great event (iii. 14-18).

The difference between this Epistle and the first traditionally ascribed to the same author, Peter, is so great, particularly in the matter of style, that as early as the time of Jerome its genuineness was doubted along with the assumption of that of the other. The two Epistles do not agree as to the nearness of the Parousia. In 1 Pet. iv. 7 "the end of all things is at hand," while in 2 Pet. iii. 8, 9, each day that separated the time of the writer from that event is declared to be "a thousand years"—an expression which, if it is not to be taken literally, at least amounts to an indefinite postponement of "the end." The term employed to designate "the coming of the Lord" is in 1 Pet. i. 7, 13, iv. 13, "revelation," while in 2 Pet. i. 16, iii. 4, it is "Parousia." While 1 Peter contains many citations from the Old Testament, this Epistle has none, and along with occasional mention of events therein recorded legends from apocryphal books are referred to without discrimination (ii. 4-8, 11, iii. 5-10). The Greek style of 2 Peter as regards vocabulary and word-forms is less Hellenistic, that is, purer, than that of 1 Peter, while in construction the first Epistle is far more skilful than the second. "Hope," which is a prominent word in 1 Peter, is unknown to the second Epistle, which has "knowledge," a term not used in the first. The false teachers, so conspicuous in this, do not appear in the first.

The conclusion which must be drawn from these facts is that the author of the second Epistle did not write the first, and that he shows in relation to it no literary dependence. The contacts with Paul so frequent in the first Epistle are almost wholly wanting in this writing. Dr. Edwin Abbott has undertaken to show its dependence on Josephus, but the question must be regarded as undecided. The writer's acquaintance with any one of the Gospels is not certainly demonstrable. But see i. 17 compared with Matt. xvii. 5. The traits of the false teachers combated resemble those delineated in the Pastoral Epistles, but it is not certain that the author was acquainted with these writings.

While the Epistle is exceptionally independent of the New Testament literature in general, it holds a unique relation to the quaint and original Epistle of Jude. The details of the relation cannot be minutely set forth here, but the conclusion which an examination of them compels is that the writer of 2 Peter knew and used that Epistle. This is now the prevailing opinion.¹ In 2 Pet. ii. 4 the conception is obscure on account of the omission of the allusion to the particular sin of the angels, which is made in Jude 6 in dependence on Gen. vi. 2 by the words, "left their proper habitation." In some places there is a revision of Jude in 2 Peter effected sometimes by omissions, sometimes by changes, and again by abridgment, with the advantage, so far as originality and force are concerned, on the side of Jude.

There are no certain traces of the use of the Epistle in Christian literature until near the end of the second century. The canon of Muratori omits it, and it is not contained in the Peshito, the Syriac translation of the New Testament. Although the existing writings of Clement of Alexandria contain no evidence of his knowledge of it, it is probable from the testimony of Eusebius that he was acquainted with

¹ See 2 Pet. ii. 4, Jude 6; 2 Pet. ii. 10, Jude 8; 2 Pet. ii. 13-17, Jude 12, 13; 2 Pet. ii. 18, Jude 16; 2 Pet. iii. 1-3, Jude 17, 18.

it, and commented on it, but we do not know that he regarded it as a writing of Peter's.

The Epistle contains many indications of a late date. Such are the mention of the "apostles" in connection with the "prophets" as an authority (iii. 2, 3), and an appeal to the writings of Paul, as if they existed in a collection (iii. 15), and as "Scriptures" (iii. 16). The Epistle of Jude is used, which belongs to the latter part of the first century or to the early part of the second. The doubts as to the second coming of Christ, which appear to have been widely prevalent, also indicate a late period. The opinion is well sustained which dates it as late as the middle of the second century, and some authorities place it not earlier than 170 and 180. The place at which it was written is indeterminable, and the author is entirely unknown.¹

¹ See the writer's article, "Peter, Epistles of," in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, vol. iii.

THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER.

EXPOSITION.

After a brief introduction and exhortations to the practice of Christian virtues, the design of the Epistle is revealed in the reference to the Parousia, in connection with which the transfiguration is mentioned, and prophecy is appealed to (i. 1-21).

Simon Peter, a servant and apostle of Jesus Christ (i. 1).—Paul calls himself the servant of Jesus Christ in Rom. i. 1. It has been conjectured that *servant and apostle* is due to a combination of the “apostle” of 1 Peter i. 1 and the “servant” of Jude 1. *To them*, etc. The address is vague and is unique in an Epistle.

Of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ (i. 1).—“Lord and Saviour” is a frequent combination of attributes of Christ; but it is questionable whether *God* should here be regarded as an attribute. Although if *God* be taken separately the article would naturally be expected before *Saviour*, the expression, “Saviour Jesus Christ,” may be used without the article as well as “Lord Jesus Christ,” which is frequently so employed.¹ See note on Tit. ii. 13. *Faith in the righteousness of God* is not faith in the righteousness which He bestows, but in that which is a quality of His nature.

Grace to you and peace be multiplied in the knowledge of God and of Jesus our Lord (i. 2).—*Knowledge* is made prominent in this Epistle (i. 3, 8, ii. 20), and here *grace and peace* are

¹ Rom. i. 7, xiv. 14; 1 Cor. i. 3.

regarded as grounded upon it, for such is the sense of *in*. It is doubtless due to the controversy with Gnosticism that prominence is given to knowledge (Gnosis) in the Epistle. To the Gnosis of the heretics is evidently here preferred that of the Lord Jesus Christ, by means of which it is declared, in ii. 2, that the pollutions of the world may be escaped. "With all the hatred against Gnosis its chief defect, a too exalted estimate of knowledge (Gnosis), is appropriated."

Seeing that, etc. (i. 3), gives the ground on which the wish of "grace and peace" (verse 2) is based. *Life* is the blessedness of the Messianic kingdom, or salvation, and *godliness* (a word which belongs almost exclusively to the Pastoral Epistles) is the piety which pertains to "the present age." These are supposed to be *granted through the knowledge of Him that called us by His own glory and virtue*. It is uncertain whether the words *him that called us* refer to God or Christ, but probably the former is the correct reference, since generally in the New Testament it is God who "calls" the believers. But the idea of a "call" *through the knowledge of Him by His own glory and virtue* is unique, and does not convey a very clear conception. *Virtue* is not elsewhere in the New Testament applied to God in the singular. The plural in the sense of "excellencies" is employed in 1 Pet. ii. 9.

It is through these, the "glory and virtue," that God's *great and precious promises* have been *granted* (i. 4). The *promises* relate to the blessedness in which the believers were expected to share at the Parousia (iii. 13), and *through these* they are said to *become partakers of the divine nature*. To refer *these* to "the things that pertain to life and godliness" is extremely forced, and *promises* is the only natural reference. Yet how the believers were to become *partakers of the divine nature through the promises* is not clear. The entire period betrays a writer who combines current words and phrases without a clear conception of their meaning and relations.

The partaking of the divine nature by believers is nowhere else mentioned in the New Testament. The nearest approach to such an idea is in Heb. xii. 10, "partakers of His holiness," and the conception of the new birth is kindred to it.

In your faith supply virtue (i. 5), that is, having *faith*, let there be *virtue* in connection with it, literally, contribute or *supply virtue* in your *faith*. The *knowledge* which should be supplied in *virtue* is Christian *knowledge* in contrast with the Gnosis of the false teachers. *Temperance* is the control of the desires in general.¹

And in your love of the brethren love (i. 7), that is, *love* toward all men.

Not idle nor unfruitful unto the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ (i. 8).—These virtues are regarded as leading to a *knowledge* of Christ, which is the true Gnosis (knowledge).

For he who lacketh these things is blind (i. 9), that is, as the writer says, "near-sighted," a word not elsewhere used in the New Testament.²

Give the more diligence to make your calling and election sure (i. 10).—In these words is implied a danger of losing the *election* through failing in practical right living.

The end of the "calling and election" is *entrance into the eternal kingdom* of Christ (i. 11), and this will be *richly supplied* to the believers if they *never slumber*. The *kingdom* is that which Christ was expected to establish at his second coming or Parousia. See verse 16, iii. 4.

Wherefore I shall be ready always to put you in remembrance of these things (i. 12).—*Wherefore*, that is, because he only will enter the "kingdom" who practises the virtues previously mentioned, and thereby makes his "calling and election sure." *These things* must be interpreted from this point of view.

Tabernacle (i. 13), that is, in the bodily life. See 2 Cor. v. 1.

¹ Acts xxiv. 25 ; Gal. v. 22.

² μυωπαζων.

Cometh swiftly, even as our Lord Jesus signified unto me (i. 14).—What words of Christ to Peter the writer had in mind is indeterminable. If he was thinking of the saying attributed to Jesus in John xxi. 18, 19, he must have misinterpreted it, for the reference there is only to a violent death, and nothing is said about its coming *swiftly*. There is, however, no evidence in the Epistle of his acquaintance with the fourth Gospel. He might have been acquainted with the tradition from which the record in John xxi. 18 was made, and, misunderstanding it, have turned it to his purpose in the rôle of Peter.

I will give diligence (i. 15).—This does not necessarily refer to an intention to write other Epistles than this.

For we did not follow cunningly devised fables (i. 16).—*For* connects somewhat loosely with "I will give diligence." *Cunningly devised fables*. This is a reference to the Gnostic myths of the false teachers.¹

When we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ (i. 16).—The Parousia is again referred to, and thus appears as the prominent theme of the Epistle.

But we were eye-witnesses of his majesty (i. 16), that is, at the transfiguration, according to verses 17 and 18. The writer's excessive zeal to make it appear that he is the veritable Peter, the apostle, is manifest. See also verse 18.

The excellent glory (i. 17) is a circumlocution for God.

And we have the word of prophecy made more sure (i. 19).—The transfiguration is regarded as a prophetic intimation of the glorious Parousia on account of the "glory" with which it was attended. But the writer thinks *the prophetic word* of the Old Testament is surer. The translation, *made more sure*, is incorrect, and conveys the idea that the prophecy of the Old Testament was enhanced as to its certainty of fulfilment by the transfiguration. The writer means to place the prophets above the intimation given in the transfiguration.

¹ 1 Tim. i. 4, iv. 7; 2 Tim. iv. 4; Tit. i. 14.

What prophecy he had in mind which he could allegorise into a foretelling of the Parousia we do not know.

Until the day dawn (i. 19).—*The day* is that of the Parousia, after which in its full splendor there will be no need to *take heed* to the word of prophecy.

No prophecy of Scripture is of private interpretation (i. 20).—The meaning of a *prophecy* does not depend upon a *private* or personal opinion of it. But whether the writer had in mind the *interpretation* of the prophet himself or of others—perhaps those who falsely interpreted the prophecies assumed to refer to the Parousia, so as to make them read to the effect that there was to be none (iii. 4), or that it had already taken place—is uncertain. The latter view is probably the correct one, and the passage may be brought into connection with verse 16.

For no prophecy ever came by the will of man; but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Ghost (i. 21).—This passage expresses the current view of the Church of the time regarding the inspiration of the Old Testament writers.

The Gnostic false teachers are now described and violently condemned (ii. 1-22).

But there arose false prophets also among the people (ii. 1).—*The people* are those of the Old Testament times, the Jews. The “murmurers,” “complainers,” and “mockers” of Jude (vv. 16, 17) appear here as *false teachers*, and since the writer of Jude, on whom the author of 2 Peter depends in this chapter, says that the apostles foretold the coming of these heretics, we see our author here assuming the rôle of an apostle and prophesying the coming of the teachers who were evidently present in the Church in his time, and are so spoken of in verses 9-11 of this chapter.

Deny even the Master that bought them (ii. 1).—*Master* is a questionable rendering of the Greek word, which is not used for Christ. “Sovereign,” that is, “God,” were a

better translation. (See Jude 4.) *Swift destruction.* This is an abrupt change from the description of the heretics to an announcement of their end.

And many shall follow their lascivious doings (ii. 2).—It appears from this passage and from *vv.* 18, 19, and 20, as well as from Jude 4, that the false teachers connected with their doctrines certain immoral precepts and practices. Besides, they sought to make gain for themselves out of their occupation.¹

And in covetousness made merchandise of the Christians (ii. 3).—Here again the writer abruptly breaks off to indicate the *destruction* of these false teachers.

For if God spared not angels when they sinned, etc. (ii. 4).—The writer now proceeds to cite three examples of summary divine judgment, in order to show that the false teachers will be speedily dealt with. The *angels* that he had in mind (Jude 6) are those who under the name of “the sons of God” are represented in the legend, Gen. vi. 1-4, as having “come in unto the daughters of men.” The passage is obscure on account of the writer’s omission of the words in Jude 6, “kept not their own principality, but left their proper habitation.” The legend is reproduced in Enoch x., and the idea of the punishment of the angels was derived from that book, where it is said that they were ordered to be “bound fast under the hills of the earth for seventy generations, until the last judgment be held for all eternity.” *Hell.* The word in the Greek is Tartarus, not elsewhere used in the New Testament. It is the word used by the Greeks for the abode of the wicked dead in the underworld.

The second example of the divine vengeance is that of the destruction of *the ancient world* by the *flood* (ii. 5).—This legend is recorded in Gen. vi. 7-viii.

The third is that of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, Gen. xix. 1-29 (ii. 6).—In Jude 7 the mention of this

¹ 1 Tim. vi. 5, 9; Tit. i. 11; Jude 16.

story is brief, and the writer of 2 Peter has considerably expanded that account.

The Lord knoweth how to deliver (ii. 9).—Here the writer, who appears to have lost sight of the conclusion which ought to follow the conditional clause beginning with verse 4, introduces a general remark on the Lord's deliverance of *the godly out of temptation*, and His keeping of *the unrighteous under punishment unto the day of judgment*, that is, until the Parousia. The doctrine evidently is that in the underworld the wicked are in a state of conscious suffering.¹

But chiefly them that walk after the flesh (ii. 10).—This verse and the following verses may be regarded as the conclusion, somewhat clumsily introduced, of the conditional clause previously mentioned, and we have here an application to the false teachers, who are bitterly and unsparingly denounced through the rest of the chapter.

And despise dominion (ii. 10).—"Thrones," "dominions," "principalities," and "powers" are names of orders of angelic beings according to the Jewish mythology.² The demonic powers are sometimes so named.³ The reference here is probably to the good angels.

They tremble not to rail at dignities (ii. 10).—*Dignities* is here used in the same sense as "dominion" in the preceding verse.

Whereas angels bring not a railing judgment against them before the Lord (ii. 11).—*Them* represents "dignities" in verse 10, but the term is here understood to mean the demonic powers. The verse would be unintelligible but for Jude 9, where the *railing judgment* relates to the devil, against whom Michael the archangel durst not bring it. The writer's thought is much confused in his dependence on Jude, and the passage is accordingly deficient in precision.

¹ See Luke xvi. 23, 24.

² Col. i. 16; 1 Pet. iii. 22; Jude 8.

³ Eph. ii. 12; Col. ii. 15.

But these, as creatures without reason, born mere animals (ii. 12).—The writer's zeal against the false teachers here betrays him into a very harsh judgment. *In their destroying be destroyed*, that is in their destructive or corrupting doings. (Compare Jude 10.)

Count it pleasure to revel in the daytime (ii. 13).—This rendering is doubtful. Probably "in a day" is the equivalent of "to a day," and the sense is "count the revel of a day a pleasure," with reference to the transient nature of the pleasure.

Spots and blemishes revelling in their love-feasts (ii. 13).—In Jude these persons are designated as "hidden rocks" in the "love-feasts" (v. 12). *Love-feasts*. Some textual authorities here read "deceivings" (ἀπάταις), instead of ἀγάπαις.

Having followed the way of Balaam, etc. (ii. 15, 16).—See Jude 11. The legend referred to is in Numb. xxii. 22-31.

These are springs without water and mists driven by a storm (ii. 17).—"Clouds without water" is the figure in Jude 12. They promise much, but perform nothing, giving water neither from the spring nor from the clouds. *The blackness of darkness* refers to the punishment of these persons (Jude 13).

Great swelling words of vanity. See Jude 16. *They entice in the lusts of the flesh, etc.* (ii. 18). See verse 2.

The last state is become worse with them than the first (ii. 20).—See Matt. xii. 45; Luke xi. 26.¹

It has happened with them according to the true proverb (ii. 22).—Of these two proverbs the former is substantially that of Prov. xxvi. 11, and the latter is otherwise unknown. The persons referred to in vv. 20-22 are the false teachers, and not those whom they mislead. At the end of the preceding verse the false teachers are spoken of as "bondservants of corruption," being brought into bondage by that

¹ Compare Heb. x. 26, 27.

with which they are "overcome," and in verse 20 they appear again as "overcome," their last state having become worse than the first.

The writer now addresses himself to the scoffers at the deferred Parousia, and describes the terrors of its coming (iii. 1-13).

This is now, beloved, the second Epistle that I write unto you (iii. 1).—This is probably a reference to the so-called first Epistle of Peter, and if so, implies a knowledge of it on the part of the writer of this Epistle, as well as his purpose to address the Christians of Asia Minor, although he omitted all address at the beginning. The writer of this Epistle, who cannot have been the author of our canonical 1 Peter, may have written another prior to this, to which he here refers. There is no improbability in the supposition that many letters were written in the name of Peter.

And in both of them I stir up your sincere mind (iii. 1).—See i. 13.

That ye should remember the words spoken before by the holy prophets through your apostles (iii. 2).—The difference in purpose, point of view, and contents of the two Epistles does not warrant this conjunction of them. *Prophets* *apostles*. The mention of *the apostles* as having coördinate authority with *the prophets* indicates the post-apostolic age.

Knowing this first, that in the last days mockers shall come, etc. (iii. 3).—*Knowing* relates to "ye" (verse 2), or, since this is not expressed in Greek, to the subject of "remember." *In the last days*. These are the days of "the end of all things," the last of the pre-Messianic age, the time just preceding the Parousia.

Where is the promise of his coming? etc. (iii. 4).—The question indicates a belief on the part of the "mockers" (Jude 18) that the *promise* of the Parousia is vain. The mention of *the fathers* as having departed without seeing the fulfilment

of the promise indicates the post-apostolic age as that of the writer, for although he here assumes the prophetic point of view, it is evident that he had before him the phenomena of his own time.

For this they wilfully forget (iii. 5).—This is said in refutation of the saying of the false teachers that “all things remain,” etc., and the writer proceeds, after a reference to the creation, to show from the fact of the deluge that things had been changed.

Heavens from of old, and an earth compacted out of water and amidst water (iii. 5).—The source of the author’s hypothesis of creation is uncertain. That the earth was *compacted out of water and by water* (for *by* and not *amidst* is the proper rendering) is not indicated in Gen. i. 6-8. There are other ancient cosmogonies, however, with which the writer’s conception accords, and he either borrowed from them or misinterpreted the account in Genesis.

By which means (iii. 6).—The original is, “by means of which” (plural), but to what the “which” refers is altogether vague. Grammatically it relates to the heavens and the earth, but it is anything but precise to say that the deluge came by means of the heavens and the earth. “Water” and “the word of God” may possibly be the antecedents of “which.” But the vagueness of the construction remains in any case.

The world that then was *perished* (iii. 6).—*Perished* must either be understood in the sense of “changed,” or *the world* must be regarded as including all that lived upon the earth at the time of the deluge, in which case the word is used with approximate accuracy.

But the heavens that now are and the earth (iii. 7).—This rendering is of doubtful propriety. It were better to read: “The heavens, etc., are by His word kept in store, reserved for fire against the day,” etc. The writer’s idea is that at the Parousia fire would sweep away the present heavens and

the earth (verse 12), and that in their place "new heavens and a new earth" (verse 13) would be provided, adapted to the Messianic kingdom of "righteousness." The earth was regarded as tainted with sin, but why it was thought that the heavens should be dissolved is not apparent. Related conceptions are expressed both in the Old and the New Testament.¹ Such fancies were also indulged in by the Stoic philosophers. One cannot but recall in this connection Paul's idea that "the creation was subjected to vanity" and was "groaning and travailing in pain" in consequence of Adam's transgression. Its hoped-for deliverance "from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God," he evidently looked for at the Parousia.² The author of 2 Peter will have it "delivered" and purified by "fire."

The destruction of ungodly men (iii. 7).—See 2 Thess. i. 9. "Ungodly men" having been put out of the way, the renovated earth, spanned by "new heavens," would be a fit abode for the saints in the Messianic kingdom. To attain this blessedness was "salvation" according to the conception of the early Christians. This was to "inherit" the kingdom of God.

But forget not this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years (iii. 8).—This is the writer's answer to those who "mocked," asking, "Where is the promise of his coming?" He appears to have abandoned the general doctrine of the early Church, expressed in 1 Pet. iv. 7, that "the end of all things is at hand," and applies with a slight variation a passage from Ps. xc. 4 in support of his position, which is that the postponement of the Parousia cannot be urged as a reason for doubting its certain coming, *for the Lord, that is, God, as in verse 8, is not slack concerning His*

¹ Ps. cii. 26, 27; Isa. xxxiv. 4, li. 6, lxvi. 15, 22; Matt. xxiv. 29, 35; 2 Thess. i. 8.

² Rom. viii. 20-22; Heb. xii. 27; Rev. xxi. 1.

promise (iii. 9). He turns the delay of the coming of Christ to good account in that he regards it as furnishing an opportunity for repentance, because God does not wish that any, being unrepentant on that day, should "perish" in the "destruction" of the ungodly.

But the day of the Lord will come as a thief (iii. 10).—This was probably a current saying among the early Christians. See Matt. xxiv. 43 ; 1 Thess. v. 2.

In the following verses (10-12) the writer expands the declaration made in verse 7, accumulating the catastrophic features of "the end of all things." *The elements*, which he thought would be *dissolved with fervent heat*, are not the heavens or the earth, but the elements of the material universe, literally, "the material causes of the world."

"The doctrine of the burning of the world, which is common to this Epistle and the first Epistle of Clement, appears first in the Jewish sibyls, and originated without doubt in the Heraclitic-Stoical theory of the periodically recurring destructions of the world by fire. It is accordingly, like purgatory, to be regarded as borrowed from the ancient nature-philosophy." So Pfeiderer ; and Holtzmann remarks upon it that this is not the only tone which the wind that blows in the Epistle has wafted from the Grecian world.

A practical exhortation is drawn from the terrible certainty of the great catastrophe (iii. 11), and the believers are told that they ought earnestly to desire the coming of the day of God, despite the fact that God is postponing it in the hope that the number of the saved may be increased by the repentance of the ungodly (iii. 14-18).

Account that the long-suffering of our Lord is salvation (iii. 15).—This is to be explained from verse 9. On the reference to Paul, see the Introduction. No such teaching of Paul's as that here referred to is found in his extant Epistles, the passage in question being supposed to be the first clause of verse 15, as is probably the case. A wider reference, as to verse 14, or to the whole subject of the Parousia, is hardly

admissible. The meaning of *wrote to you* is indeterminable, since this Epistle is without address. But the writer adds that Paul taught the doctrine in question in all his Epistles when *speaking of these things*. So comprehensive a statement shakes our confidence in the writer and raises the question whether he was in fact at all acquainted with Paul's Epistles, and did not simply wish to associate the apostle with Peter, in whose name he wrote, in the interest of a harmonising of the Pauline and Petrine parties. The mention of *all* the Epistles of Paul manifestly implies the existence of a collection of them known to the writer, or to his readers, or to both, and the designation of them as Scripture, implied in *other Scriptures*, necessarily puts a late date upon this Epistle. If *other Scriptures* be not referred to the Old Testament—a reference which would indicate a date when, according to the history of the canon, the New Testament writings were placed as "Scriptures" on an equal footing with the former, that is, not far from the end of the second century¹—the term must probably mean some of the current Christian writings, Epistles, apocalypses, etc., and we must suppose the author to have written at a time when a beginning at least was being made of the formation of a collection of such writings as now compose our New Testament.

Ye therefore, beloved, knowing these things beforehand (iii. 17), that is, that the false teachers would come before the Parousia, *beware lest ye fall from your own steadfastness*. "Forewarned is forearmed." The peril was great, for the apostles would share the fate of the ungodly on that day, that is, "destruction" (verse 7).

The remark that the unlearned and unstable wrest the difficult things in Paul's Epistle to their own destruction may have reference to the interpretation of his doctrine of the abolition of the law (antinomianism) in the interest of

¹ See the "Sketch of the History of the Canon of the New Testament" at the end of this volume.

licence. The perils of this teaching appear to have been pointed out by some of Paul's opponents during his own life (Rom. iii. 8, vi. 1).

But grow in the grace and knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ (iii. 18).—The writer's predilection for *knowledge* here appears again. The Epistle ends with a doxology ascribed to Christ.

THE EPISTLE OF JUDE.

INTRODUCTION.

IN Luke's list of the apostles (vi. 16) is mentioned a Judas, the son of James, but who the James in question was is unknown. The author of this Epistle calls himself Judas the brother of James, thereby rendering it certain that he was not the apostle Jude, apart from the improbability that an apostle in writing an Epistle would not call himself an apostle rather than the brother of some one of the name of James. The probability, then, is that this writer wished to pass for Jude the brother of James the brother of Jesus.¹ The Epistle is without definite address, the writer having in mind as readers "them that are called, beloved in God the Father, and kept for Jesus Christ." There is no reason for supposing that it was intended especially for Jewish Christian readers.

The object of the Epistle is to combat certain tendencies to false doctrine among the readers and a libertine mode of life represented by men who, the writer says, had "crept in privily," and whose influence was in the direction not only of "lasciviousness," but also of a denial of Christ (*vv.* 3, 4). They "rail at dignities," that is, the angelic powers, are "mockers," and have not the Spirit (*vv.* 8, 18, 20). The false teaching of certain Gnostic sects, with which libertinism was connected, was probably in the writer's mind. The

¹ Matt. xiii. 55.

particular sects in question can only be conjectured, but that they belonged to the second century is probable.

The writer did not discriminate between the Old Testament canonical writings and the so-called apocryphal books, depending upon the Book of Enoch for his reference to the sin and punishment of the "angels" and upon tradition for his account of the contest between the devil and the archangel Michael. He also quotes words which he says Enoch "prophesied" (*v.* 14).

Indications of the late date of the Epistle appear in the traits of the doctrines of the false teachers which are those of the second-century Gnostics. They "deny the only Master (Ruler) and our Lord Jesus Christ" (*v.* 4), as the Gnostics did in asserting that the Creator of the world was not "the only" supreme God, and in maintaining that Christ was not such a being as the Christians thought him to be. As there were Gnostics who made a sort of religious cult of their lasciviousness and sexual looseness, so the writer charges the enemies of the Church with turning the grace of God into lasciviousness, says that they "defile the flesh," and are "hidden rocks in the love-feasts" (*vv.* 4, 8, 12). A late date is also indicated in the way in which "faith" is spoken of as an objective traditional doctrine, instead of a subjective state or attitude of mind (*vv.* 3, 20). The expression, "the words spoken before by the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ" (*v.* 17), suits not the apostolic, but the post-apostolic age.

The Epistle was used by the writer of 2 Peter not very long probably after it was written, but apart from this there is no certain trace of its use until after the close of the second century. The canon of Muratori mentions it as received in the Catholic Church or among the catholic Epistles. The text of the Muratorian fragment is, however, uncertain at this point. Origen mentions it as being "full of powerful words of heavenly grace," yet he speaks with reserve in

saying, "if any one receives the Epistle of Jude." Eusebiu accounts it "controverted," and remarks that not many of the ancients have made mention of it, while Jerome says it was "rejected by many" in his time. Nearly one half of the Epistle is composed of references to and extracts from Old Testament and apocryphal stories. The style is clear, strong, and vivid, and the writer appears as a man much in earnest and severe against the false teachers, while zealous and solicitous for the purity of the faith, and for the right living of the believers.¹

¹ See the writer's article, "Jude, Epistle of," in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, vol. ii.

THE EPISTLE OF JUDE.

EXPOSITION.

After the greeting the writer proceeds at once to warn his readers against the false teachers, whom he condemns with great severity (vv. 1-16).

Judas, a servant of Jesus Christ and brother of James kept for Jesus Christ (v. 1).—Beloved in God. *In* is causal, and at the same time expresses the idea of the fellowship in which "the elect" are supposed to stand with God.

Kept for Jesus Christ, that is, preserved for him from the perils of apostasy so threatening at the time, so that when he should come they might be his (1 Pet. i. 5).

While I was giving all diligence to write unto you of our common salvation, I was constrained, etc. (v. 3).—The implication is that the writer was either in the act or on the point of writing to persons unknown to us a letter perhaps more extended than this on the subject of "salvation," but found himself "constrained" to write them an exhortation to steadfastness in the faith which they had through tradition. *Faith* here means not an attitude of mind, but a fixed doctrine, such as might be "delivered" from one generation to another, a sort of consensus of Christian belief. On account of the appearance of false teachers there was need, as the writer thought, that the believers should *contend earnestly* for this faith.

For there are certain men crept in privily . . . set forth

unto this condemnation (v. 4).—The false teachers are regarded as having crept in stealthily, that is, they do not really belong among the Christians because not in accord with them. *Set forth unto this condemnation.* The original is literally “designated beforehand in writing,” and the idea of the author appears to be that they were written of in the Old Testament prophecies or in those of the Book of Enoch, or perhaps recorded in God’s book of judgment analogous to that in which the believers were conceived to be “enrolled in heaven.”¹ The divine foreknowledge and predestination are implied in this conception.²

Turning the grace of God into lasciviousness (v. 4), that is, they have made *the grace of God* granted them in the privileges of the Christian Communion an occasion for lascivious practices, so that under the cloak of religion they live as libertines.

And denying our only Master and Lord Jesus Christ (v. 4).—This should not be taken as a single conception, but should read “the only Sovereign [God] and our Lord Jesus Christ.” The word rendered *Master* is not used of Christ in the New Testament (see 2 Pet. ii. 1). This was the Gnostic denial of God as the “only” and Supreme Ruler in attributing the creation of the world to a subordinate divinity. The Gnostic view of Christ also differed materially from that of the orthodox Christians.

Now I desire to put you in remembrance, though ye know all things once for all, etc. (v. 5), that is, though the things of which the writer is about to speak are not unknown to his readers. He now proceeds to give three examples of such a divine judgment as threatens the persons mentioned in verse 4.

Having saved a people out of the land of Egypt, afterward destroyed them that believed not (v. 5).—What destruction is referred to is uncertain. It has been supposed to be that of

¹ Heb. xii. 23.

² 2 Pet. ii. 3.

the twenty-four thousand mentioned in Numb. xxv. 1-9, the Babylonian exile, the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, and the perishing in the wilderness during the assumed forty years' sojourn there. See Heb. iii. 16-19.

And angels which kept not their own principality, but left their proper habitation (v. 6).—See 2 Pet. ii. 4. The legend of the angels who corrupted themselves "with the daughters of men" appears to have been derived from the Book of Enoch, chapters x. and xii., since their punishment is explicitly pointed out, as it is there, while in Gen. vi. 1, 2, there is no mention of it. In Enoch xii. the angels are said to have "left the high heaven and their holy eternal place" and to have "corrupted themselves with women." *The judgment of the great day* is that of the Parousia or "the end of all things."

Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, etc. (v. 7).—See 2 Pet. ii. 6. In Gen. xix. no other cities are mentioned, but see Deut. xxix. 23. *Gone after strange flesh.* See Lev. xviii. 22-24; Gen. xix. 5.

Are set forth as an example, suffering the punishment of eternal fire (v. 7).—This is probably to be explained from the tradition that beneath the Dead Sea raged a subterranean fire.

In their dreams defile the flesh, and set at nought dominion and rail at dignities (v. 8).—Besides having voluptuous dreams and imaginings, the result of their lascivious waking thoughts and deeds, they set at nought and rail at the angelic powers¹; but since "dominions," "powers," etc. are employed of both good and bad angels, it is probable that *dignities* here refers to the latter on account of the following verse, the sense of which is that they have a presumption which Michael did not possess, since he did not bring a railing judgment against the devil while disputing with him *about the body of Moses (v. 9)*. The legend in question is not contained in the Book of Enoch, and where the

¹ 2 Pet. ii. 10.

writer found it we do not know. He may have taken it from an apocryphal writing, "The Assumption of Moses," which according to Origen contained it, or from a tradition which ran to the effect that God intrusted the burial of Moses to Michael, but the devil resisted it on the ground that Moses was a murderer, and did not deserve a decent interment—a remarkable case of scrupulousness on the part of Satan !

And what they understand naturally, like the creatures without reason, in those things are they destroyed (v. 10).—The reference here is to the "flesh," the natural impulses of the senses (vv. 4, 8, 16). Following these tendencies *like the creatures without reason*, they destroy themselves by their excesses.

Woe unto them ! for they went in the way of Cain, ran riotously in the error of Balaam for hire, and perished in the gainsaying of Korah (v. 11).—The past tense is used in *went*, *ran*, and *perished*, because the writer looks at the completed acts and the judgment from the point of view of the execution of the latter, and thinks of the consummation of his *Woe !*

In the way of Cain (v. 11).—The application is not apparent, since fratricide is not one of the crimes charged against the false teachers. The case of *Balaam*¹ is referred to as an example of disobedience *for hire*. See 2 Pet. ii. 15. The false teachers are reproached for taking pay for their instruction.² The case of Korah is taken from Num. xvi. The writer sees the false teachers perish, as did Korah, on account of their *gainsaying*.

Hidden rocks in your love-feasts (v. 12).—In 2 Pet. ii. 13 a word similar in form to that used here is employed, the meaning of which is "spots." *Hidden* is not called for by the meaning of the word, which is simply "cliffs" or "rocks." As these imperil ships, so does the conduct of the false teachers endanger the salvation of those who par-

¹ Num. xxii., xxiii.

² 1 Tim. vi. 5.

take of the *love-feasts* with them. The word rendered *love-feasts* is not used elsewhere in the New Testament except in 2 Pet. ii. 13, where the reading is doubtful. *Clouds without water*, etc. This figure and those that follow are intended to indicate the unstable and unfruitful character of the false teachers.

The blackness of darkness (v. 13) refers to the punishment reserved for them.

And to these also Enoch, the seventh from Adam, prophesied (vv. 14-15).—In the Book of Enoch he is called the *seventh from Adam*, probably as a distinction on account of the sacredness of the number seven. The words quoted from this apocryphal work are found substantially in Enoch i. 9.

These are murmurers, complainers, walking after their own lusts (and their mouth speaketh great swelling words), shewing respect of persons for advantage (v. 16).—See 2 Pet. ii. 18. What these persons murmured and complained about is not indicated. Probably they found fault with everything that they did not like in the doctrine and administration of the Church. The word translated *complainers* means persons discontented with their lot. *Shewing respect*, etc., would perhaps be better rendered “admiring men’s person.” The desire of these men to make profit out of their occupation is here again indicated.

After declaring that the apostles had foretold the appearance of the false teachers, the writer exhorts his readers with respect to the traditional faith and the love of God, and closes with a doxology (vv. 17-25).

But ye, beloved, remember ye the words which have been spoken before by the apostles, etc. (v. 17).—The writer could hardly have so spoken of *the apostles* if he had accounted himself one of them. One writing in the post-apostolic age would naturally thus speak of them as having announced certain phenomena which he then saw before him. *Said to*

you does not necessarily mean that the unknown persons addressed had heard *the apostles*.

In the last time there shall be mockers, etc. (v. 17).—This is not necessarily to be regarded as a quotation from any spoken or written words of “the apostles.” Probably the writer had a vague idea of some such announcement. See 1 Tim. iv. 1 ; 2 Tim. iii. 1, iv. 3 ; Acts xx. 29, 30.

In the last time there shall be mockers (v. 18).—See 2 Pet. iii. 3. *Sensual*, that is, “natural,” or “animal.” The same word is used in Jas. iii. 15 of the “wisdom” of certain persons opposed to the true faith—a wisdom also characterised as “devilish.”

Having not the Spirit (v. 19), that is, the Holy Spirit, which was believed to be bestowed upon Christians generally.

Your most holy faith (v. 20).—See note on verse 3. *The mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ*, which he would show at his Parousia, when the believers would enter into *eternal life* or the Messianic kingdom.

And on some have mercy who are in doubt (v. 22).—According to the most approved reading this should be, “and some rebuke when they contend,” or “separate themselves,” that is, apostatise. *Who are in doubt* is not, however, an incorrect rendering of the Greek word.

Hating even the garment spotted by the flesh (v. 23).—This may be intended literally, but is probably symbolical in the sense, “shun everything that can even outwardly contaminate the inner life, through intercourse with the persons in question.”

Now unto Him *that is able* (v. 23).—The Epistle closes with an ascription of praise to God, who is called *Saviour*, as in 1 Tim. i. 1, ii. 3 ; Tit. i. 3, ii. 10, iii. 4.

A SKETCH OF THE HISTORY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CANON.¹

THE history of the canon of the New Testament is occupied with the early fortune of the writings composing it, the use that was made of them, and the estimation in which they were held until they were united to the exclusion of all others in a collection regarded as canonical,² that is, as constituting the rule of faith and practice for Christians. Since Christianity originated in Judaism, the first Christians recognised the Old Testament as a sacred and authoritative book, regarded its writers as inspired, and appealed to it in confirmation even of their new religion. This was their Scripture, and was quoted with such formulas as, "the Scripture saith," "as it is written," etc. It was long before any of the Christian writings, Gospels or Epistles, received such a recognition or became a canonical authority alongside of the Old Testament. It is evident that the history of the canon of the New Testament, which must consider the opinions held in the primitive Church concerning the several books composing it prior to the time when they came to be generally regarded as a sacred or canonical literature, has nothing to do with investigating the origin or composition of these writings, their date, their authorship, the inspiration of their authors, and kindred questions.

If it shall appear in the course of the inquiry that the

¹ For a more detailed and extended treatment of this subject the reader is referred to the author's *Gospel-Criticism and Historical Christianity*, chap. ii., pp. 27-118, and the works therein referred to. In the present sketch use has been made to some extent of that treatise.

² κανὼν, a rule.

books in question were at one time regarded in the Church as merely human productions, and at another as the infallible works of inspired men, in each case we shall have nothing more than an historical fact, which may, indeed, be explicable in its genesis, but which will decisively answer no questions respecting their internal character. The historian of the canon has nothing to do with traditions regarding the various writings except to study them historically. A tradition that arose in or near the apostolic age will naturally be deemed important, since it may fairly be assumed to have arisen among men who had valuable sources of information ; but it must be genetically examined, and subjected to critical tests, precisely as traditions of a later origin should be treated.

What, then, is precisely the idea of canonicity that must be kept in mind in the course of this study, and that alone comports with a really historical examination of the history of the canon ? What, in a word, does it signify that certain biographies of Jesus and certain Epistles were selected out of the large number of such writings, and honoured with an exclusive authority as canonical ? It is just here that the limits of a purely historical investigation appear.

The canonicity of the New Testament writings, so far as an historical inquiry has to do with it, is simply the reputation in which they were held during a certain period as the best or the most trustworthy among the current writings of a similar character. Just as certain productions of other ancient literatures have been honoured as classical by the common judgment of mankind, so a few books of the early Christian literature were regarded in the primitive Church as most worthy of confidence and most excellent in form, and were separated from others as canonical. Classical and canonical are terms of substantially the same import from the historical point of view.¹

¹ Eusebius furnishes a confirmation of this view of the matter when

Even if we consider the term "canonical" from another point of view, according to which the canonicity of a biblical writing is regarded as determined by its genuineness, or by its conformity to Christian doctrine as set forth in writings of undisputed validity and eminence, it will be found to have its origin in an act of judgment very similar to that by which some writings are called classical in distinction from all others. For the discussion of questions of this sort is always carried on with reference to a certain standard, conformity to which determines the canonicity referred to, just as conformity to a literary standard marks a writing as classical. It is doubtless from this point of view that the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Apocalypse, and some other New Testament books are sometimes treated as if their canonicity were open to question, and that Luther called the Epistle of James an "Epistle of straw."

Neither its supposed apostolical authorship nor the decree of an ecclesiastical council assigning it a place on the canonical list can permanently establish the real canonicity of a writing. Very likely a feeling or a judgment like that just referred to was an important if not a determining factor in the formation of the New Testament canon in the early Church, and the recognition everywhere and by all (*ubique et ab omnibus*) of certain writings as canonical was the result of their supposed conformity to a standard that existed in the Christian consciousness of the time.

The term "canonicity," however, when applied to a writing of certain books, the Gospels of Peter, Thomas, the Acts of the Apostles by Andrew and John, and other writings "adduced by heretics," he says: "The character of the style itself is very different from that of the apostles, and the sentiment and the purport of those things which are advanced in them, deviating as far as possible from sound orthodoxy, evidently prove that they are the fictions of heretical men, whence they are not only to be ranked among the spurious writings, but are to be rejected as altogether absurd and impious."—*Hist. Eccles.*, iii. 25.

biblical writing to mark it as infallible or inspired, is dogmatic, and has no other foundation than an assumption of the infallibility of the writer. It is scarcely necessary to say that no one of the New Testament writers has set up such a claim for himself as dogmatic theologians have gratuitously made for all of them. With this sort of canonicity it is evident that criticism can have no sympathy, since it admits of no presumptions of the kind as to the character of the writings in question, but requires that the results of the critical process be awaited as the only right ground of all judgments regarding their origin, purpose, and claims to be regarded as exceptional productions.

The historical treatment of the canon of the New Testament has never been regarded with favour from the dogmatic point of view, and is, indeed, of modern origin. Notwithstanding the fact, which the history of the canon clearly shows, that the early Church, at least after the second century, exercised considerable critical discrimination regarding the canonicity of the New Testament writings, and that in the classical passage in Eusebius (iii. 25) the doubts respecting certain books, since accepted as canonical, which prevailed as early as the beginning of the fourth century, are set forth in detail, it was not until the first decade of the eighteenth century that these doubts began to be brought forward again. Semler's thorough criticism showed that the canon of the New Testament was a gradual growth, which only reached a relative completion toward the end of the second century.

I.—THE APOSTOLIC AGE.

The so-called apostolic age, extending toward the close of the fourth century, furnished few conditions favourable to the formation of a canon of such Christian writings as then existed, or, indeed, to the creation of a Christian literature. The religion of Jesus found its first adherents not among the

cultivated classes, but among the lowly and poor, to whom literature was unknown. Paul writes to the church in Corinth, which was perhaps composed of as cultivated people as could be found in any of the churches of the middle of the first century, that not many of them were "wise men after the fashion of this world, not many mighty, not many noble." This age was, too, without an historical perspective. It had no conception of a future development of Christianity extending through many centuries. Its horizon was extremely narrow. The early Christians believed that "the last days" were "at hand," when Jesus would appear a second time in "glory" for the establishment of the Messianic kingdom. Under such conditions literary productions intended for the instruction of future ages or the collection of existing writings for a remote result could not be expected.

That "unlearned and common men"¹ should occupy themselves with such matters is *a priori* improbable, except that under the spur of necessity and for immediate ends they might set down some things in a fragmentary way in writing. Even Paul was lacking in historical foresight, and we have from him only writings for the occasion, called forth by the immediate needs of the communities to which they were addressed. There is no evidence, and scarcely is there a probability, that he intended his Epistles to constitute a sacred canonical literature for appeal and citation by future generations. He did not think himself to be specially inspired to write. He thought, indeed, that he had "the Spirit" and "the word of God," but in no especial sense. All the believers of the time were supposed to be endowed with the Holy Spirit, which was the common "grace" and privilege of all who had accepted Jesus.² He appealed to the Old Testament as the only authoritative Scripture that he knew,³

¹ Acts iv. 13.

² Gal. iii. 2, 5; 1 Cor. iii. 16; Rom. viii. 9.

³ 1 Cor. ix. 9, 10, x. 11; Gal. iii. 8.

and applied passages from it by a strained allegorising to the circumstances of his own time.

Tendencies, however, toward the formation of a canon are observable in the apostolic age and in the time immediately succeeding it. For as such may be regarded the reading in the churches of some of the Epistles of Paul.¹ But there is no trace of any such recognition of the Gospels, and the apostolic literature contains no reference to them. A sort of "oral canon" of the gospel existed in the valued "words of the Lord," or the sayings of Jesus, with which, however, Paul shows surprisingly few contacts. His account of the institution of the Lord's Supper is one of the most striking of these.² Apart from the crucifixion and the resurrection, he appeared to care little for the tradition of Jesus.

It is not, indeed, improbable that some of the most important sayings of Jesus may have been committed to writing as early as the date of the great Pauline Epistles. An old tradition runs to the effect that a writing ascribed to Matthew was early in circulation, in which were set down certain "oracles" ³ of Christ in the vernacular of the people.⁴ But there is no trace of its use in the apostolic age beyond its probable incorporation in our synoptic Gospels, and its date is altogether a matter of conjecture. The writings composing our New Testament do not all belong to the apostolic age, but tendencies found in the later ones toward a canonical recognition of some of the earlier may properly be noted here.

In the so-called Second Epistle of Peter⁵ occurs mention of the commandment of the Saviour through the apostles in immediate connection with the words of "the holy prophets," and Paul's Epistles are spoken of as if existing in a collection, and are placed side by side with "the other Scriptures." The date of this Epistle is uncertain, but it may fairly be

¹ 1 Thess. v. 27.

² 1 Cor. xi. 23-25.

³ λόγια.

⁴ Euseb., *Hist. Eccl.*, iii. 39.

⁵ iii. 2, 16.

concluded that in the early part of the second century the Epistles of Paul had been collected and copied, and were considerably used, perhaps even read in the churches along with the Old Testament. But we are far at this period from a New Testament canon as such.

II.—THE POST-APOSTOLIC AGE.

From the latter part of the first century to the end of the first quarter of the second, conditions existed and influences were at work of considerable importance to the formation of the canon. We cannot, however, think of the Christians of this period as entertaining views of the writings composing the New Testament similar to those now held by believers. The oral tradition of the life and teachings of Jesus still existed, and was continually propagated by the preachers and teachers in the public religious assemblies. Epistles from leaders in the churches must have been frequently received and read, and those of Paul were doubtless circulated and copied. Perhaps fragmentary narratives of the life of Jesus had a similar fortune. That many such existed appears from the prologue to the third Gospel, where they are expressly mentioned.

No especial, exclusive sanctity appears, however, to have been attached to these writings; and when our canonical Gospels were completed, and came into the hands of the people, there could have been no reason, either from their contents in comparison with other writings of the kind in circulation or from any claims put forth by their authors, for regarding them as possessing a divine sanction. Indeed, the author of the third Gospel makes it very apparent in the introduction to his narrative that he undertook the work after the manner of an ordinary biographer who wishes accurately to instruct a friend.

Besides, the reverence felt by the Jewish Christians for the

Old Testament must have rendered them reluctant to place upon an equal footing with it any other writings, particularly such as set up no claims to inspiration in their authors. Moreover, we may reasonably suppose that there was carried over from the apostolic age into this the belief in the gift of the Holy Spirit as common to all Christians, so that writings as such would not naturally be invested with a peculiarly sacred character.¹

Such an agreement among many persons to accept certain writings and reject others, as is implied in the formation of a canon, presupposes considerable communication and intercourse—a condition requiring a long period of time in view of the means of transportation and the wide dispersion of the Christians at the time in question. When we consider, besides, the absence of an organisation through which a general consensus might be obtained and expressed, we see the impossibility of an early agreement of the several communities of believers respecting the canonical authority of the early Christian writings.

In such a condition of affairs there could not but be a considerable development of individual freedom of opinion in isolated churches and a corresponding narrowness and provincialism of judgment as well as decided predilections in favour of certain writings. Such tendencies and preferences could not but operate unfavourably to the settlement of the canon. If we join to these considerations the fact that the age was uncritical, that is, not inclined in the nature of the case to undertake a recension of manuscripts and to examine the claims of writers to special authority, when none stood forth with preëminent authorisation, we shall find the critical selection and sifting of books and the distinguishing of some of them by a general consensus as exclusively to be accepted the remotest of probabilities.

Another obstacle to the formation of the canon was the

¹ Clem. Rom., 1 ad Cor. ii. 46; Barnab., ix., xvi., xix.

conflict, dating from the apostolic age, between those who favoured and those who opposed the Pauline doctrine that the gentiles should be admitted into the Christian fold without submission to the Jewish ceremonial law. It required a long time to effect an adjustment of these differences, and although the liberal view of Paul prevailed, it did not succeed at once by the exclusion of all that opposed it; and accordingly there stand side by side in our canon Gospels and Epistles in which the opinions representing it and those opposed to it and those of a mediating tendency are more or less openly expressed.

The important witnesses for this period are Clement of Rome, Barnabas, and Hermas. Their testimony must be considered with regard to the current opinions in their time respecting the inspiration and authority of the Christian literature then in use. In order to ascertain what were the earliest tendencies toward the formation of a canon, they must be questioned as to the nature of the writings in their hands and as to their manner of using them for quotation or for illustration.

1. *Clement of Rome*.—Without entering upon the question of the genuineness of the Epistles ascribed to Clement, it is sufficient to remark that his first Epistle addressed to the Corinthians was probably written at the end of the first century or in the first quarter of the second. The writer was evidently a diligent student of Paul's writings, and once expressly mentions him as "the blessed Paul," the author of an Epistle, which is not specified. We cannot determine how many Epistles he knew, but his injunction to the Corinthians to "take up the Epistle of Paul"¹ implies a use of some of them in the churches of the time and perhaps the public reading of them in the religious assemblies, which was the first step toward the acceptance of writings as

¹ "Take up the Epistle of the blessed Paul the apostle. Of a truth he charged you in the Spirit concerning himself and Cephas and Apollos, because even then ye had made parties."

canonical, since they were thereby placed side by side with the sacred Scriptures of the Old Testament. No citations, properly speaking, from the Gospels are found in Clement. "The words of Jesus our Lord" are referred to, and reproduced in one or two instances, apparently from memory, but not in the form of accurate quotations.

The writer shows no evidence of an acquaintance with any of our Gospels, and does not mention or refer to them. The most that can be inferred from his repetition of sayings of Jesus is that he had read some writings in which they were recorded, probably our first Gospel and possibly the third. But his acquaintance with some Gospels and Epistles is all that can be affirmed. He does not intimate that he regarded them as "Scripture," that is, as authoritative and inspired writings. His inaccurate quotations and his ascription of sayings to Jesus that are not found in our Gospels show that there was to him no exclusively sacred text recording the life and teachings of the Master.

2. *The Epistle of Barnabas*.—This writing, falsely attributed to Barnabas,¹ was composed at about the same time as the first Epistle of Clement, and was held in high regard by some of the Christian fathers. The writer shows no intellectual grasp, no profound apprehension of Christianity, and carries the allegorical and typological method of interpretation to the utmost extremes. He was evidently acquainted with Romans and perhaps with Galatians and 2 Corinthians, but he does not mention the Epistles by name, or treat them as sacred writings. His quotations of sayings of Jesus bear a strong resemblance to the record of them in the first Gospel. In iv. 14 he cites the words, "many are called, but few chosen," with the formula, "as it is written," and some have regarded this as a quotation from Matt. xxii. 14 as sacred Scripture. But apart from the circumstance that the source of the quotation is uncertain, this

¹ Acts iv. 26, xii. 25, xiii. 1.

single instance cannot be regarded as establishing the fact that in the first quarter of the second century our Gospels were reputed to constitute a sacred Scripture, especially since this writer ascribes to Jesus sayings that are not contained in them. Westcott admits that the proverbial phrase introduced by the formula of Scripture-quotation may by a failure of memory have been ascribed by the writer to some book of the Old Testament—a confusion similar to that which occurs several times in Justin Martyr.

3. *The Shepherd of Hermas*.—An ancient tradition, ascribed to a certain Hermas, mentioned by Paul,¹—the writing known by this title. It was, however, written in the first half of the second century. Like the Epistle of Barnabas, it was highly esteemed in the primitive Church, and thought by Origen to be “divinely inspired.” It consists of visions, commandments, and similitudes, and is destitute of literary interest. A scholar who has written a treatise on it characterises it as “the most spiritless book that the ancient Church has handed down to us.”² The fact that such men as Clement of Alexandria and Origen could value it so highly as they did shakes our confidence in their judgment on matters connected with the early Christian literature. It has very little to do with the facts of historical Christianity.

The writer knew 1 Corinthians, Ephesians, and James, and possibly Hebrews and 1 Peter, but he neither mentions nor refers to any Epistle or Gospel. Westcott goes too far in maintaining that he was familiar with our Gospels, and even made allusions to the fourth. Weiss says that the work contains no certain trace of them, and finds only an “accord” with Mark x. 24. The writer, in common with the authors of Clement and Barnabas, believed that all the Christians of the time had received the Holy Spirit, and appears to think himself as well qualified as the apostles to write for the edification of the Church. The idea of citing a

¹ Rom. xvi. 4.

² Jachmann, *Der Hirte des Hermas*.

supposed apostolical writing as an authority seems never to have occurred to him.

4. *The Didache*.—The writing technically known as the *Didache*, or “The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles,” or, according to its sub-title, “The Teaching of the Lord through the Twelve Apostles,” should be mentioned in this connection, since it probably belongs to about the time of Clement and Barnabas, though placed later by some authorities. Its object is to present in a simple form the rules that should govern the Christian life. It has been well remarked that such a writing would have been impossible had an authoritative canon of the New Testament been in existence at the time when it was written ; and it shows by the total absence of reference to the books that have since become canonical that the author knew nothing of an inspired Christian literature.

The only canonical authority recognised in this writing is the Old Testament, from which several quotations are made in due form. The Gospels of Matthew and Luke appear to have been known to the writer, and he quotes from them with such indifference to accuracy as is indicated in combining different passages and making additions of his own. He speaks of “the gospel” and “the teaching of the gospel,” but does not refer to any Gospel-writing. Once he quotes with “it is said” a saying, the origin of which is unknown. Nothing is quoted from the Epistles of the New Testament, although the author was probably acquainted with some of Paul’s and perhaps with Titus and 1 Peter.

5. *The Gospel of Peter*.—The recently discovered Fragment of the Gospel of Peter should also have a brief notice in this connection, on account of its relation to our canonical Gospels and its importance to the history of the canon. It belongs probably to the early part of the second century, and its treatment of the older Gospels accords with the attitude toward them of the writings of that period already considered. The Fragment discloses a close relation to our

synoptic Gospels, but deviates from them in details, particularly in the account of the resurrection. Dr. Harnack regards it as proved, or nearly proved, that the writer knew our Gospel according to Mark. But it is doubtful whether he was acquainted with the first Gospel in the form in which it now exists, since, although he follows its narrative in some respects, he deviates from it in several particulars, and omits incidents that he could hardly have omitted had he known it. If his record was based on Matthew's, he regarded the latter as of little importance, as is shown by the liberties that he takes with it. But he very likely followed traditions and legends that the author of the first Gospel used, and may have drawn from that narrative also.

The relation of the Fragment to the third Gospel is similar to that which it holds to the first. If the writer knew it, he used it with great freedom, and even ventured to correct it. If he knew the fourth Gospel at all, he paid little attention to it, and corrected it in an important particular. His sources may have been the same as those of its author. Such an attitude toward our canonical Gospels on the part of a writer living in the second century is of great significance respecting the question of canonicity.

If a writer undertaking to compose a history of the life of Jesus and having some of our Gospels in his possession could take such liberties with them as this writer takes, it is evident that they could not then have been regarded as constituting a sacred literature produced by divine inspiration, that is, could not have been looked upon as canonical in the sense that this word later came to have. The *existence* of our Gospels at the time in question is one thing, and the treatment that they receive in the literature of the period is quite another. The whole question of the canon is involved in the latter consideration. The fact that a second-century writer quotes a Gospel or an Epistle is of little moment. The important matter is *how* he quotes it.

III.—PAPIAS AND HEGESIPPUS.

No works of Papias, bishop of Hieropolis, remain, but Eusebius records that he wrote a work entitled, "Expositions of the Oracles of the Lord." This writing was probably composed near the middle of the second century, and the fragments that Eusebius has preserved are important for the history of the canon. "The Oracles of the Lord" are the sayings of Jesus, and the consideration of chief moment in the case is, what sources did Papias use for these sayings? His own words as reported by Eusebius answer this question. He says that he gave place in his book to everything that he heard from the "elders"; that whenever he met anyone who had been a follower of the elders, he inquired about the discourses of these; and that he did not think he could derive so much profit from the contents of books as from the utterances of the living and abiding voice.¹ Books, then, it appears, Papias knew, that contained the sayings or "oracles" (λόγια) of Jesus. What these were Eusebius informs us in the following passages: "Of Matthew he [Papias] stated as follows: 'Matthew composed the oracles (logia) in the Hebrew [Aramaic] dialect, and everyone translated them as he was able.' " "And John the presbyter also said this: 'Mark being the interpreter of Peter, whatever he recorded he wrote with great accuracy, but not, however, in the order in which it was spoken or done by our Lord, for he neither knew nor followed our Lord, but was a follower of Peter, who gave him such information as was necessary, but not to give a history of our Lord's discourses. Wherefore Mark has not erred in anything by writing some things as he has, for he was carefully attentive to one thing, not to pass by anything that he heard, or to state anything falsely in these accounts.' " It does not belong to this inquiry to determine whether the Aramaean Matthew and the

¹ Euseb., *Hist. Eccl.*, iii. 39.

Mark mentioned by Papias were our first and second canonical Gospels, or were rather earlier writings that served as a basis for them. It is enough that the books were a sort of Gospel-writings, and that he speaks of only two of the kind.

We are especially concerned with the manner in which Papias introduces the books. He appears to regard them as the works of ordinary historians, which may be supplemented by such information as he may be able to pick up from oral sources. In the absence of any intimation that he thought the writers inspired or the works authoritative, and in the declaration that he preferred oral to written sources, he shows that he had not the slightest idea of a canonical New Testament book or books.

Papias's account of the death of Judas shows that he put confidence in sources that do not agree with our canonical records. He relates that Judas's body, having so swollen that he could not pass where a chariot could easily pass, he was crushed by the chariot, so that his bowels were emptied out. Again, according to Eusebius, "he relates a story of a woman accused of many sins before the Lord, which is contained in the Gospel according to the Hebrews." Eusebius mentions no reference by Papias to our third Gospel or to the fourth, but says that "he used testimonies from 1 Peter and 1 John." He appears to have passed Paul by without mention and to have quoted none of his Epistles, while it is reported that he regarded the Revelation as inspired.¹

¹ "Eusebius promises (*H. E.*, iii. 3) to record (1) the quotations of ecclesiastical writers from 'disputed books,' (2) '*what they have said about the Canonical Scriptures and the uncanonical as well.*' His promise to include the latter we have reason to believe that he faithfully keeps. But he gives no extracts from Papias about Luke and John. It may be reasonably inferred that Papias was silent about them. This silence may have proceeded from either of two causes: (1) John and Luke may not have been recognised by Papias as on an equality with Mark and Matthew; (2) though recognising them as authoritative, Papias may have had nothing to say about them. The

Hegesippus, a Palestinian Jewish Christian, after making a journey to Rome about the middle of the second century and visiting many churches on his way, wrote, "Memoirs of the Unerring Tradition of the Apostolic Message," of which Eusebius has preserved a few fragments. He reported that he found everywhere "that which the law and the prophets and the Lord enjoin." The first two terms relate, of course, to the Old Testament, and a first step toward the formation of the canon of the New Testament is indicated by joining with this ancient standard the words of the Lord, or the sayings of Jesus.

It is, however, noteworthy that Hegesippus does not refer to the sources of his knowledge of that which the Lord enjoins, that is, he says nothing of any one of our four Gospels, and reveals no conception of a series of canonical New

latter of these alternatives just mentioned is highly improbable. Papias dwells on the defect of order or arrangement (*τάξις*) in Mark, who, he says, never even contemplated an orderly treatise (*σύνταξιν*) of the logia. And Luke avowed it as one of his objects to write in (chronological) order (*καθεξῆς*), and Luke's order differs not only from that of Matthew, but also from that of John. It is hard to believe, then, that Papias 'would have nothing to say' about Luke if he recognised Luke. Again, as regards John, would not Papias have naturally added what the Muratorian Fragment says—that this want of order was corrected by John, who wrote 'in order (*per ordinem*)'? The Muratorian Fragment, Clement of Alexandria, and the anonymous tradition preserved by Eusebius (iii. 24) all *have something of great importance* to tell us about the original authorship of the 'spiritual' Gospel of John, the disciple of the Lord, and what they say testifies to the interest taken in its origin by those ecclesiastical writers who were among the first to recognise it as apostolical. Is it likely that Papias, if he acknowledged it to be the work of the last of the apostles, knew *nothing about it that he deemed worth saying*? These considerations point to the conclusion that Luke and John were not recognised by Papias as on a level with Mark and Matthew."—E. A. Abbott, in article "Gospels," in *Encyclopædia Biblica*, vol. ii. column 1813.

Testament writings. But Eusebius expressly states that he quoted from the apocryphal Gospel according to the Hebrews. He was, however, probably acquainted with our first and third Gospels—a fact which, if incontestably established, as it is not, would prove what no one disputes, that they were then in existence. Their recognition as canonical is, as has already been pointed out, quite another matter. Hegesippus appears to have known some of the Pauline and the Pastoral Epistles, expressions from which he appropriates without acknowledgment.

IV.—JUSTIN MARTYR.

Justin, who was of Greek descent and a student of the Grecian philosophy, wrote two defences (“Apologies”) of the Christian religion and a dialogue with Trypho, from A.D. 145–160. The study of his works is of great importance to the history of the canon, for the reason that he made extensive quotations from early records of Christian history. He frequently informs us that his citations as to the life and teachings of Jesus are taken from a work or works that he calls “Memoirs of the Apostles,” but he does not designate the author or authors of those Memoirs by name.

The number of citations is very large, and their resemblances to and differences from their parallels in our Gospels render the question of their source very difficult. Various hypotheses have been advocated: That he drew from an original or originals from which our Gospels were derived; that his Memoirs were the Gospel according to the Hebrews; that he used a harmony or combined narrative; and that our canonical Gospels furnished the greater part of his materials.

The way in which Justin speaks of his sources is a consideration of importance. “Memoirs of the Apostles” is a somewhat inexact term, if it was intended to apply to our

Gospels, only two of which were ostensibly written by apostles. Though he once adds the explanatory words, "which are called Gospels," and once quotes words which, he says, are "written in the Gospel," it is impossible to determine what Gospel or Gospels he had in mind, since with the single exception of a "Gospel of Peter" mentioned once, he does not connect any particular author with his sources.

It is well known that many writings ascribed to apostles and others were early in circulation purporting to be Gospels (the Gospels according to Peter, James, the Twelve, Thomas, the Hebrews, etc.), and it would be a begging of the question to assert that whenever Justin mentioned Gospels in general he had in mind precisely our four. Justin's remark that the Memoirs were read along with the prophets in the Christian assemblies for worship throws no light on their character or on the estimation in which they were held, since many of the early Christian writings not afterward admitted into the canon were so used.

What Justin omits to say about his sources is also of importance. He does not give the names of their authors, and does not imply that they were regarded as canonical, but he cites them simply as historical documents without an intimation that they were thought to be inerrant, although he held so rigid a doctrine of the inspiration of the Old Testament authors that he has been called "the Doctor of Inspiration." Indeed, his faith in the statements made in his Memoirs rests upon the belief that the events related in them had been foretold by the prophets.

Since Justin often quotes inaccurately from the Old Testament, and sometimes refers passages to the wrong authors, his carelessness in quoting his Memoirs does not go to establish the hypothesis that they were not exclusively our Gospels. But opposed to it is the fact that he mentions incidents in the life of Jesus not recorded in the latter, such as that Jesus was born in a cave near Bethlehem. Now

several uncanonical Gospels record this tradition, and the presumption is that he derived it from them, and that they belonged to his Memoirs. The incidents also that he relates, that at the baptism of Jesus a fire was kindled in the Jordan, and that when Jesus came out of the water a voice came from the heavens: "Thou art my beloved Son, this day have I begotten thee," are found in the fragments of the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

Many similar examples could be cited from Justin's works, showing that his sources were not exclusively our Gospels, and that he derived numerous incidents from apocryphal Gospels, and related them as if they were as authentic as any others.

It must suffice, without further discussion of the difficult question, to state the results that have been reached by two of the fairest and ablest scholars, who have thoroughly examined the whole subject. Credner says: "Justin was acquainted with our canonical Gospels, but used them little or not at all immediately. The basis of his quotations was a writing different from them, which can hardly have been any other than his own recension of the manifold Gospel according to the Hebrews, the same which often appears also as the Gospel of Peter, and which must have arisen from a harmonising combination of the evangelic history."

Hilgenfeld, who has written an extended treatise on the subject, thus presents his conclusions in substance: "Justin knew Matthew, Mark, and Luke, and his acquaintance with the fourth Gospel can hardly be denied. He advances beyond Papias, and marks a certain contrast to him in that he totally excludes the oral tradition as a source of the knowledge of the life of Jesus, and has everything relating thereto in written Gospels. These apostolical Memoirs Justin reckons among the writings which belong to the Christians, and reports that they were read along with the prophets in the Sunday-assemblies for worship. Thus in him we

approach nearer in every respect to the conception of a collection of the sacred writings of Christianity. Yet with all this approximation it cannot be denied that Justin limits the conception of holy Scripture to the Old Testament, and does not transfer it to the Christian writings. Everywhere, whether he contend with Jew or heathen, only the books of the Old Testament are recognised by him as holy Scripture. Justin agrees entirely with Papias in holding exclusively to the *twelve* apostles. Besides the Gospels, he recognises the Revelation as the work of the apostle John. But no mention of the apostle Paul and his letters is found in Justin; rather they are directly excluded. Accordingly, the Epistles of Paul are not reckoned by him among the Christian writings. The fourth Gospel might possibly have found its way into his Gospel-harmony on account of the name of the apostle John.¹ But in the evangelic quotations of Justin we find much that is so peculiar as to require reference to an uncanonical Gospel."

The opinion expressed in the foregoing summary of Hilgenfeld's conclusion should be supplemented by the remark that while Justin apparently with intention omits mention of Paul and his writings, there are in his works unmistakable indications of his acquaintance with the chief Pauline Epistles, Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, and Philippians, and with Colossians and Ephesians. He had evidently read

¹ E. A. Abbott is of the opinion that "if Justin knew John, he refused to base any statement on it." "It is generally recognised that the Synoptists do not teach, whereas John and Justin do teach, Christ's preëxistence, the feeding on Christ's 'flesh and blood' (as expressed in those precise words), the application of the term 'only-begotten' to Christ, and the Logos-doctrine. When, therefore, we find Justin either not appealing to any authority, in behalf of these doctrines, or appealing to pointless passages in the Synoptists instead of pointed passages in John, it is a legitimate inference that Justin did not recognise John as on a level with the Synoptists."—Art. "Gospels" in *Encycl. Biblica*, vol. ii. col. 1835.

them or heard them read. But he could not have attached to them any special sacredness and authority, for he believed in the inspiration of all Christians from the beginning down to his own time, and no doubt thought himself to be as good an authority as any preceding writer of a Gospel or an Epistle.

The attempt to explain Justin's quotations by the exclusion of all our Gospels, which has been made by the author of "*Supernatural Religion*," and that of Westcott and Norton by the exclusion of all other sources than these except oral tradition, are both extreme and hardly tenable. The essential facts in the case for the historian of the canon are, however, independent of the vexed question of the character of his *Memoirs*, and are rather that, granting that he knew and used our Gospels, he nowhere intimates that they were to him anything more than ordinary historical documents ; that he does not regard or treat them as exclusive sources of information, but draws freely from another source or other sources, probably written ; that he fails generally to identify any of the records that he uses by giving the names of their real or supposed authors ; that the only sacred Scripture that he recognises is the Old Testament, the supposed prophecies in which relating to events of the life of Jesus are paramount and conclusive evidence to him of the significance of these events for the divine mission of Christ ; and that, finally, he does not reveal in his writings any well-defined discrimination as to canonical and uncanonical writings, but is apparently unconscious of such a distinction.

V.—THE CLEMENTINE HOMILIES, BASILIDES, AND
VALENTINE.

An imaginary contest of arguments between Peter and Simon Magus, supposed to personate Paul, written in the interest of the anti-Pauline party in the Church, is represented in the so-called Clementine Homilies, which date

from after the middle of the second century. The work is a forgery in the name of Clement of Rome, and has little interest or importance except for the history of the canon. While Justin expressly mentions his sources as "Memoirs of the Apostles," this writer designates no sources, and does not mention any Gospel by name. Only three or four exact quotations from our Gospels occur among a large number of references to sayings and acts of Jesus, and some are not found in them at all, *c. g.*, "Be ye approved money-changers," and "Why do ye not discern the good reason of the Scriptures?"

Hilgenfeld's conclusion is doubtless correct, that along with our four canonical Gospels the writer used an uncanonical one, while the author of "Supernatural Religion" undertakes too much in maintaining that he used none of our records. He was acquainted with the Epistles to about the extent of Hermas's knowledge of them.

With respect to Basilides, a leader of a Gnostic sect, who wrote about 125, little accurate information is attainable, since his writings have perished, and we know nothing of them except what the later writers who opposed him tell us. Reuss's summing up of the case must suffice for our purpose: "The exegesis of the Gnostics attached itself above all to the words of Jesus in order to bring out of them their own dogmas. But these words either circulated in a purely traditional form, or were embodied in writings more or less different, more or less circulated, but yet not sorted by an ecclesiastical authority, and all serving equally according to the occasion the use one wished to make of them. Now nothing was easier than to form new collections of this sort either by making extracts from those that one had at hand, or by combining several books, or by composing one's self accounts under the direct influence of the preoccupations of the system. There are famous examples of each one of these

methods.”¹ The fact that Basilides had no idea of a canon of the New Testament is evident in that he did not confine himself to whatever writings he may have had, but appealed to the authority of a certain Glaucius whom he declared to have been an interpreter of Peter, and made use of some traditions of Matthias, who, it was maintained, had had private intercourse with Jesus. He is reported to have written a commentary on “the gospel,” whatever that term may have meant to him, and interpretations made by himself and his followers of some synoptic passages and of portions of Romans, 1 Corinthians, and perhaps 1 Peter are mentioned by later writers.

Valentine, another Gnostic leader of about the middle of the second century, makes no direct appeal to the Gospels in the fragments of his writings that have been preserved in quotations from homilies and letters. Later writers charge him with introducing alterations, corrections, etc., in some of the Epistles. Origen says that his followers even altered the form of the Gospel, and Irenæus says that this sect brought forward their own compositions as Gospels, and entitled one of their books “The Gospel of Truth,” “though it accorded in no respect with the Gospels of the apostles.” The fact that Valentine was acquainted with Paul’s Epistles and that he argued, as Holtzmann maintains, from the Gospel of Matthew, proves nothing more than the existence and use of these writings in his time. There is absolutely no evidence that they were regarded as exclusive and authoritative sources, that is, as canonical.

In view of the considerable number of Gospels that were in circulation in the second century, the use by these writers of isolated passages that are found in our canonical Gospels, without reference to the particular source, does not go far towards establishing the genuineness of these records.

¹ *Histoire du Canon*, p. 70.

Credner has well stated the circumstances and conditions of this period : " The early Church saw come forth from its bosom a multitude of the most contradictory asseverations and systems, which were more or less foreign to the true sense of the Christian doctrine, and which were afterward condemned by the orthodox as heretical. It was not intentional hostility to Christianity by which these so-called heretics were animated. It was rather in the case of the majority at least an honest seeking after truth and the in-born striving of the thoughtful and intelligent man to bring an earlier mode of thought, in which he had been reared, and perhaps grown grey, into accord with a new and to him acceptable teaching. But these strivings would certainly have turned out quite differently, certainly there would have been no Corinthians, Valentinians, Marcionites, and other sects of heretics of whatever name, at least not in the form that they assumed, had the doctrines of Christianity been then laid down in divinely attested writings, and not in mere tradition. This assertion will be established if we are able to show that all these heretics sought to confirm their doctrines not by an appeal to certain writings authorised in the Church, but to oral and written tradition, just as we have found to be the case with the orthodox Christians." ¹

The establishment of this fact may be regarded as one of the assured results of historical investigation into the condition of the Church in the second century, to which no one contributed more in his time than the candid scholar from whom the preceding quotation is taken.

VI.—MARCION AND TATIAN.

The great Gnostic heretic, Marcion, a man of noble character and life, undertook with sincere purpose the purification of Christianity. He believed that it had become corrupted

¹ *Beiträge*, i. 36.

with Jewish elements, and supported his belief by the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians. The twelve apostles, being Jews, had in his opinion mingled their national ideas with the teaching of Jesus, and he discovered Jewish and anti-Jewish tendencies in the current Christian writings. He accordingly undertook to construct a canon of his own by selecting out of the various existing books a few, which he regarded as least affected by Judaism, taking considerable liberty with them in the way of changes and excisions. He thought that Paul was the only genuine apostle, and accordingly his collection of writings, made soon after the middle of the second century, was composed of those that came from the great apostles and from his followers. He chose ten Epistles: Romans, Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, Ephesians (which according to Tertullian he called "to the Laodiceans"), Colossians, Philippians, and Philemon.

The precise character of Marcion's Gospel, and he chose only one, is indeterminable, but it is probable that he used a somewhat modified Gospel according to Luke. But it is not important for the present purpose to determine the precise character of Marcion's Gospel, since our task is to ascertain the estimation in which the Gospels in general were held, and how they were treated in Marcion's time. His procedure furnishes the desired information on this point in two or three conclusive facts: He did not ascribe his Gospel to any author, at least we have no information from his opponents that he did so; he simply called it "the Gospel" (*τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*); he admitted that he changed the original text, and gave his reasons for doing so.

Now the taking of such liberties with a writing is irreconcilable with a belief in its infallibility or inspiration, and Marcion's procedure was in accord with the point of view of his time in which, as has been shown, no trace can be found of a belief in the exclusive divine inspiration of the writings afterwards united in the New Testament and regarded as

canonical. Accordingly, his adaptation of a single Gospel to his purposes along with the rejection of others, his reception of some Epistles that pleased him and his exclusion of others, were in accordance with the opinions and practices of his age, in which Christians were accustomed to rely upon oral tradition and to quote writings afterward rejected as uncanonical, as if they were as authoritative as those finally accepted.

It has been remarked that the general laxity of belief and usage regarding canonicity is evident from the fact that there does not appear to have been any objection raised against Marcion's procedure in his own time. It was unfortunate for his fame that he took a Gospel that was afterward received as canonical, and treated it with so much freedom. But had such an opinion of its sanctity as could alone justify a condemnation of him existed in his time, it is certainly unaccountable that his contemporary, Justin Martyr, who frequently brings charges against the Marcionites, did not raise his voice against such a profanation of sacred documents.¹

Tatian, an Assyrian by birth, was in Rome a disciple of Justin. An oration or apology, addressed to the Greeks, alone remains of his writings, and in this he shows, not by express mention or quotation, but by "contacts," his acquaintance with some of Paul's Epistles, with the Epistle to Titus, and with the four Gospels. This work dates from the third quarter of the second century, and his performance denotes a tendency toward the formation of the canon, in that he sought to make some of the Pauline Epistles more readable by improving on their literary style—an indication that they were esteemed as works suitable for edification and probably for public reading in the churches.

Tatian was also the author of a harmony of the four Gos-

¹ Credner, *Beiträge*, i. 44.

pels, which is known as "the Gospel by Four," or the "Diatessaron." Eusebius is the first to mention this work, and he speaks of it as "a certain amalgamation and collection of the Gospels," put together he knows not how. Theodoret, about the middle of the fifth century, reports that he had seen it, that it did not contain the genealogies or any other parts that declare that Jesus was born of the seed of David, that it was used by others than those of his own [heretical] sect who in their "simplicity" did not see the evil of it, and that he collected above ten thousand copies of it, and put them aside as dangerous.

It appears that Ephraem of Edessa wrote a commentary on the Diatessaron about the middle of the fourth century, of which in 1876 Massinger published a Latin translation from the Aramaic. More recently a supposed Arabic translation of the Diatessaron has been discovered. All this shows nothing more than that our Gospels existed in the third quarter of the second century, and that they were held in sufficient esteem as records of the life of Jesus to induce Tatian to make a harmony of them.

On the contrary, the fact that Tatian took such liberties with the Gospels as to make excisions of portions of them that did not accord with his doctrine proves that he attached no special sacredness to these records. Historical documents regarded as without special sanction he might, indeed, have treated in this way, but records believed by him to be infallible he would rather have undertaken to bring into accord with his theories by means of a violent exegesis, as the writers of his time treated the Old Testament, and as all dogmatists since his time have treated the Bible. Since his tampering with the Gospels was carried to such a degree that the good and orthodox Theodoret thought his harmony unfit for the use of sound Christians, it is evident that he had no conception of a New Testament canon.¹ In this

¹ "What may be the correct inferences from Theodoret's account

respect he was in accord with the general point of view of his age.

VII.—DIONYSIUS OF CORINTH, MELITO OF SARDIS, AND
ATHENAGORAS.

Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, was the author of a letter to Soter, bishop of Rome, of which a few fragments remain. In these he makes complaint that certain "apostles of the devil" had taken the liberty to change some of his letters by additions and excisions, and adds that "it is not surprising if some have recklessly ventured to adulterate the Scriptures of the Lord, when they have corrupted those that are not of so much importance."

It is a legitimate inference from these words that a sharp line of distinction was then drawn (about the last quarter of the second century) between the writer's own productions and certain writings recording the words of "the Lord," or Christ; but there is no intimation that a canon of the New Testament yet existed, for at this time many spurious Gospels and other writings, not finally accepted as canonical, were read in the churches and quoted as "inspired." Dionysius, indeed, informs the Romans that the Epistles of Clement and of Soter, their bishops, were read in his church, and since the Epistles of Paul to this church can hardly have been neglected, the inference is very natural that no exclusively sacred or canonical character can have been accorded to the latter. It is worthy of note that the Gospels are not mentioned among the books read in the churches.

of Tatian's excisions and of the 'mischief of the composition,' and what ought to be inferred from Eusebius's (probably) contemptuous statement about the work, are questions that do not affect Tatian's recognition of John. All agree that before the end of his life, *i. e.*, about 170-180 A.D., he recognised the four Gospels as being of special authority, although his notions of authority may not have prevented him from handling them with considerable freedom."—E. A. Abbott, art. "Gospels," in *Encycl. Biblica*, vol. ii. col. 1839.

From the fact that Melito, bishop of Sardis, made a collection of the books of the Old Covenant, the inference has been drawn that he was acquainted with a corresponding list of canonical New Testament books. But while the Old Covenant implies the New, a canon of the former does not imply one of the latter, since the distinction of the two Covenants was made in the New Testament itself long before a canon of the latter was thought of. It may, however, be admitted that Melito regarded a New Testament canon as attainable and even desirable, but there exist no means of knowing what books he or the Christians of his time (the last quarter of the second century) would have included in such a collection. On the contrary, everything goes to show that no general agreement on the subject had been, or in the nature of the case could have been, reached at this time.

In the "Apology" of Athenagoras, written about 176, occur a few sentences from the Sermon on the Mount and some passages from the Pauline Epistles, but the writer does not indicate any of the Gospels or Epistles by name, and gives no sign of regard for them as exclusively authoritative or canonical writings. To him the true source of authority is the Old Testament.

VIII.—THEOPHILUS OF ANTIOCH AND THE CANON OF MURATORI.

The three books of Theophilus to Autolycus, written in the latter part of the second century, are an important witness for the canon, and denote a decided advance toward its formation. He is the first writer who explicitly refers the fourth Gospel to John, whom he calls one of the "vessels of the Spirit." While he employs "holy Scripture" for the Old Testament only, he quotes from the first Gospel and some of the Epistles with the formula, "the divine word says," and calls "the evangelic voice" "the divine word."

The so-called Canon of Muratori, discovered at Milan in the seventeenth century by Muratori in a manuscript of the eighth or ninth century, is an anonymous list of the sacred books accepted by the Roman Church, although the first two Gospels are wanting at the beginning. It is the oldest list of the kind that is known, having probably been made toward the end of the second century. Hilgenfeld remarks that "the conception of holy Scriptures of the New Testament appears here already fully formed." The first words of the Fragment are the conclusion of a sentence, "at which [*quibus*] nevertheless he was present, and he so placed [it]." This sentence is supposed to relate to the Gospel of Mark, and the preceding, which is wholly absent, to that of Matthew. Then follow the words: "Third Book of the Gospel according to Luke. Luke, that physician, after the ascension of Christ, when Paul took him with him as studious of the right, wrote it in his name, as he deemed best; nevertheless he had not himself seen the Lord in the flesh, and he followed him according as he was able, beginning thus from the nativity of John." The text then proceeds to narrate some strange circumstances connected with the origin of the fourth Gospel, which it ascribes to John "of the disciples," as follows: "Being entreated by his fellow-disciples, and his bishops, John said, 'Fast with me for three days from this time, and, whatever shall be revealed to each one of us, let us relate it to one another.' On the same night it was revealed to Andrew, one of the apostles, that John should relate all things in his own name aided by the revision of all," etc.

Then follows a mention of Acts as containing a record by Luke and of thirteen Epistles ascribed to Paul, with an arrangement different from that in our canon and with reasons assigned for writing some of them. An Epistle to the Laodiceans and one to the Alexandrians (supposed by some to be that to the Hebrews), "forged under the name

of Paul," and "many others," it is declared, cannot be received in the Catholic Church. The remark that these two Epistles are rejected because written in the interest of the heresy of Marcion indicates a discrimination between apostolical and heretical writings. "Gall should not be mixed with honey," says the writer. On account of the corruption of the text it is impossible to determine whether the Book of the Wisdom of Solomon is included or not.

The writer appears to say that Jude and two of John are received in the Catholic Church "as the Wisdom of Solomon written by his friends in his honour," but "as" (*ut*) may be "and" (*et*). The former reading implies that Jude and "two of John" were written in honour of these apostles by their friends, and the latter, that they are received along with the Wisdom of Solomon. Two apocalypses "only" are received according to the Fragment, that of John and that of Peter, which latter "some of us are unwilling," it is said, "to have read in the churches,"—a remark that shows the influence of the churches in the matter of canonicity.

The Shepherd of Hermas is recommended for private reading, but is excluded from public use. The Epistles ascribed to James and Peter are not mentioned, and nothing is said of Hebrews, unless the Epistle to the Alexandrians, which is rejected, be identified with it. The Fragment concludes with the rejection of compositions of the Gnostic heretics, Valentine and Basilides. It is important to observe that nothing is said of the supposed inspiration of the writings accepted, but apparently real or supposed apostolical authorship is a consideration of moment, since letters "forged under the name of Paul" are rejected, although no suspicion of forgery is thrown upon the Revelation of Peter as a reason why some did not think it ought to be read in the churches.

In forming a judgment respecting this so-called canon, it

should be borne in mind that the author is wholly unknown ; that the manuscript dates from the eighth or ninth century ; that, as Donaldson suggests, it may have received interpolations, although the presumption of interpolation should not have great weight in the absence of evidence,¹ and finally, that in the light of the conclusions of the preceding investigations, the Fragment would present a strange anachronism at any time before about the end of the second century. The writer does not give his own opinion regarding the books mentioned, but professedly the general sentiment of the Church. If, now, in writings of undisputed date and genuineness, we do not find that prior to about the end of the second century the books of the New Testament are mentioned and massed after the manner of this Fragment of uncertain date and unknown authorship, this fact ought certainly to have great weight in determining its importance for the history of the canon.

IX.—IRENÆUS AND TERTULLIAN.

In his work “ Against the Heretics,” written about 190, Irenæus appeals to most of the writings of the New Testament as holy Scripture and puts them substantially on an equality with the Old Testament. He gives the tradition regarding the composition of the four Gospels ; but he manifests no inclination toward a critical judgment, apparently satisfied to record the traditional view of the origin of the Gospels. He reports, after Papias, that Matthew wrote a Gospel in the dialect of the Hebrews, but as to the important relation of this to our first Greek Gospel he is uncritically silent. His testimony, then, amounts only to this, that in his time our four Gospels were traditionally accepted, and ascribed to the writers whose names were associated with them.

¹ Donaldson thinks that the passage regarding the date shows signs of having been tampered with.—*Hist. Chr. Doct. and Life*, iii. 209.

Irenæus's reasons for accepting four Gospels are such as that there are four quarters of the globe, four general winds, etc. He admits, however, that the fourth Gospel was disputed by some. That the Gospels were not in his judgment self-authenticating is evident from the remark that "if any say that our Lord did these things [miracles] only in appearance [it seems there were then doubters of the miracles], we shall refer them to the prophetic declarations, and shall show from them that all these things were strictly foretold." He cites the Gospels, however, with the same formula that he uses in citing the Old Testament, and refers to Matthew as "inspired." The apostles are to him the authentic source of Christian truth. He accepts the Epistles traditionally ascribed to Paul (but not Hebrews as Paul's), 1 and 2 John, and the Revelation. He recognises Acts, and one passage indicates his acquaintance with James.

Tertullian, whose activity extended into the second decade of the third century, accepted on "the authority of the apostolic churches" our four Gospels, Mark being brought into recognition as apostolic through Peter, and Luke through Paul, to whom he says the third Gospel is generally ascribed, since "it is allowable that that which scholars publish should be regarded as their masters' work." Besides the Gospels he admitted Acts, thirteen Epistles ascribed to Paul (excluding Hebrews, which, however, he found recognised by some), 1 John and Revelation, Jude, and 1 Peter.

Tertullian acknowledged the Shepherd of Hermas prior to his conversion to Montanism, after which he rejected it as "an Epistle of adulterers." The Epistle of James is not mentioned in his writings, but in one passage a phrase seems to imply acquaintance with it. He speaks a good word, however, for the Epistle of Barnabas. His conception of canonicity was evidently not well defined, and his attitude

toward the whole subject was uncritical, his criterion being, "that has been derived by tradition from the apostles which has been preserved in the churches of the apostles."

X.—THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND THE CANON.

In the absence of means of easy communication between the different and often widely separated Christian communities in the second century, the conception of unity and a common bond of faith and fellowship among them must have been slowly developed. The journeys, however, of prominent teachers among the various little communities and the letters occasionally sent from the leader of one of them to the brethren in another must have tended to generate the idea of a whole Church, or a Church throughout all, that is, a Catholic or universal Church. The Gnostic controversy, however, probably contributed more than any other influence to bring the churches to a consciousness of historic unity.

The appeal to tradition was not, indeed, unknown apart from the exigencies of this controversy, in the midst of which it became the very natural and general resort of the defenders of the orthodoxy of the times. It was deemed the best answer to the speculations of the heretics to set forth the fundamental doctrines of primitive Christianity, as they had been handed down from Christ through the apostles and their successors. The creed was simple and in a few words. There was one God, who had created the world by His Son, the Word. This latter had inspired the prophets, had finally become flesh, and preached the new kingdom of God ; had been crucified, raised from the dead, and was seated at the right hand of God, whence he sent forth the Holy Spirit upon believers. At length, and very soon, he would return in glory in the great Parousia to take them to himself and to punish the unbelievers. This was "the Rule of Faith,"

which had been handed down, and which was deemed essential to the integrity of the Church and the soundness of the individual believer.

Above all questions of mere interpretation of Scripture, it appeared to the orthodox contestants to be of supreme importance to determine the grounds of the authority of the writings themselves ; and it is natural that in proportion as the conception of canonicity was formed and defined, the tendency in this direction should become more pronounced and positive, particularly in the controversy with heretics. To minds untrained in critical investigation, the appeal to the venerated tradition of the Church furnished the most congenial source of confirmation. What Christ had taught, and the apostles preached, could be determined in no way so well as through the churches in which " the living word " had been preached and handed down.

We have seen that to Papias " the living voice " was that of individual teachers. It is not surprising that with the consolidation of the Church a change should take place in the form of the appeal to tradition ; and in Tertullian a change is, in fact, observable. For he finds the standard of right knowledge and belief as well as of true interpretation in the tradition of the churches from the apostolic age down through the entire succession. When the heretics denied the infallibility of the apostles, and maintained that these were incapable of comprehending the profounder sense of the teachings of Jesus ; when they referred to the disagreement between Peter and Paul, it was maintained by the defenders of the faith that only among themselves, the real descendants of the apostles, was the genuine tradition to be found, on which the true faith could alone be established, and in accordance with which alone a right interpretation was possible.

It was but a step from this appeal to the tradition of the churches, which derived its chief worth from its apostolic

source, to an appeal to the writings of a supposed apostolic origin, so as to meet the heretics with weapons drawn from the armoury of Scripture texts. Their denial of the participation of the Supreme God in the revelation of the Old Testament could not be more effectively answered than by an appeal to apostolic writings recognised as equal in authority to that, as inspired—in a word, as holy Scripture. The ground of their validity was their supposed connection with the apostles in their origin and their conformity in doctrine with what was believed to be the genuine apostolic tradition as held in the churches. A striking illustration of this point of view is furnished in a proceeding of Serapion, bishop of Antioch, at the end of the second century.

It appears that a division had arisen in the church at Rhosse in reference to the Gospel of Peter. Serapion, in order to appease the strife, at first permitted the Gospel to be read, presumably because of its supposed apostolic origin. But having learned afterward that it contained some heretical teachings, he forbade its use. He declared the principle on which he acted to be that Peter and the other apostles are to be accepted as Christ himself, but that the writings which falsely go under their names are to be rejected.

The consolidation of the Catholic Church, then, was the condition of the settlement of the canon of the New Testament. As the Church came to a consciousness of itself ; as the instinct of self-preservation in the conflict with heresy more and more united it ; as the appeal to the apostolic tradition, preserved in its various branches, and to writings believed to be of apostolic origin became a necessity ; as an authority held to be above question could not be dispensed with in the exigencies of its development, it found itself constrained to hold fast to its revelation contained in the teachings of the apostles, to exclude all writings that deviated from the traditional catholic faith, and to collect the documents of this revelation in a canon or rule of faith and

practice. Apostolic in origin, that is, written by apostles or by men who had been in intercourse with them, and apostolic in doctrine according to the tradition of the churches, must all writings be that were accepted as canonical.

The chief promoters of canon-forming were probably the bishops, and it is likely, as Holtzmann maintains against Tischendorf, Bleek, and others, that the process of establishing the canon would have been much slower than it was, if it had been obliged to wait upon the agreement of the churches through general enlightenment and mutual understanding. The bishops, tracing their succession from the apostles, would naturally regard the writings of these as the true standard of Catholic orthodoxy. The procedure of Serapion, previously mentioned, is a good illustration of the fact and the necessity of episcopal supervision in the matter of accepting and rejecting the current writings. Clothed with authority in matters of doctrine they would naturally be looked to for a decision as to what books should be read in the churches and should thus receive a sort of canonical recognition.

It would doubtless be an error to suppose that the leaders in the Church during the latter part of the second century engaged, after the manner of modern theologians, in critical researches to establish a canon of the New Testament Scriptures. As little are we justified in thinking them to have been preoccupied with the absolute and exclusive authority of the supposed apostolic writings. True representatives of the catholic tendency, which has remained essentially the same to the present day in the Roman Church, their predominant interest was ecclesiastical. They were far from assuming the Protestant attitude toward the Scriptures or toward tradition. According to one of them, the Spirit of God comes to individuals only through the Church, so that one may say not only that "the Church is where the Spirit is, but also that the Spirit is where the Church is." They

taught that the depositaries of tradition, the chiefs of the different communities, especially of those founded by the apostles, above all that of Rome, were the best teachers of the truth.

XI.—THE CANON OF THE ALEXANDRIAN CHURCH.

The Alexandrians treated the conception of canonicity with greater freedom and in a more spiritualising way than did the western Church. Clement (170-211) not only took into account the external, apostolic origin of Christian writings, but also their spiritual derivation from the apostles, or the question of their contents as worthy or unworthy of their authorship. The perils of this subjective view were controlled to some extent by a regard for testimony, and modified somewhat by philological criticism. The Epistle to the Hebrews, for example, attributed in the Western Church to Barnabas, was regarded by Clement as the work of Paul, because worthy of the apostle. It was thought to have been written in Hebrew, and the translation was ascribed to Luke, because of a similarity in its style to Acts.

According to Eusebius, Clement's canon, in a work now existing in only a few fragments, comprised the entire New Testament, including Hebrews and certain "disputed" writings, such as the Epistle of Jude and the Catholic Epistles, and, besides, the Epistle of Barnabas and the Apocalypse of Peter. In the works of his still in existence, he does not use 3 John, 2 Peter, and James, but does cite the writings of Barnabas and Clement of Rome as apostolic, and Hermas as "inspired." He also quotes other writings not since recognised as canonical, and does not definitely discriminate between our four Gospels and the Gospels according to the Hebrews and the Egyptians. It is evident that his conception of a New Testament canon was not very well defined.

Origen's canon denotes some advance upon that of Clement, and we find him distinguishing between "acknowledged" and "disputed" books. He accepted the four Gospels, Acts, the Epistles traditionally ascribed to Paul (that to the Hebrews, however, not being generally acknowledged), seven Catholic Epistles (1 Peter and 1 John only without doubt), and the Revelation. He mentions, besides the Gospel according to the Hebrews without full recognition, the Gospel according to Peter, and the so-called Protevangelium of James. The Epistles of James, Jude, 2 and 3 John, and 2 Peter are not accorded an unquestionable recognition. Expressions more favourable to some of these, however, appear in those of his works that exist only in a Latin translation. He cites Hermas as "Scripture," and regards it as "inspired."

XII.—FROM EUSEBIUS TO AUGUSTINE.

Eusebius, in the first half of the fourth century, mentions as "acknowledged" writings the four Gospels, Acts, thirteen Epistles ascribed to Paul (excluding Hebrews as "disputed"), 1 Peter, 1 John, and, "if one please," the Revelation of John. Among the "disputed" books he reckons James, Jude, 2 Peter, and 2 and 3 John. Another division includes the "spurious" writings,—Acts of Paul, the Shepherd of Hermas, the Revelation of Peter, the Epistle of Barnabas, the Apostolical Constitutions, and finally, "if one please," the Revelation of John, "which is rejected by some, and accepted by others."

Cyrril of Jerusalem, about the middle of the fourth century, recognised as "acknowledged" seven Catholic Epistles and the Epistle to the Hebrews, but rejected the Revelation of John. Athanasius in the East, however, accepted the Revelation, besides the four Gospels, the Acts, fourteen Epistles of Paul (including Hebrews), and seven Catholic

Epistles. He recognised as books "to be read" the Apostolical Constitutions and the Shepherd of Hermas, but he was unable with all his influence to secure general recognition for the Revelation in the Eastern Church.

Theodorus of Mopsuestia, in the first quarter of the fifth century, entertained doubts of the Epistle of James, while at about the same time Rufinus accepted Hebrews and the Revelation. Jerome also acknowledged these, while admitting that all did not agree with him. With respect to 2 Peter, James, Jude, and 2 and 3 John he admits a preponderating rejection, and while he reckons Barnabas among the apocryphal writings, he speaks of the first Epistle of Clement of Rome and the Shepherd of Hermas as read in some churches. Under the influence of Augustine, in the first quarter of the fifth century, the western canon was closed with the admission of Hebrews, which in the synod of Carthage in 397 had been mentioned apart from the thirteen Epistles ascribed to Paul, but which in the synod of the year 419 was admitted into the list of the apostle's writings.

The oldest list of the writings of the New Testament made by a synod is that of the synod of Laodicea, the date of which is uncertain. It was probably held not far from the middle of the fourth century. The decree of this council relative to the New Testament canon recognises the four Gospels, Acts, fourteen Epistles ascribed to Paul (including Hebrews), seven Catholic Epistles, James, two of Peter, three of John, and Jude. The Pauline Epistles are placed after the Catholic, and the Revelation is not mentioned. The genuineness of this canon (No. 60) has been disputed, but it is generally accepted. In the Syrian Church, however, the Peshito, a Syriac translation of the New Testament of uncertain date, which appears as a recognised authority about the middle of the fourth century, contains James and Hebrews, but omits 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude, and the Revelation.

XIII.—THE REFORMATION AND THE CANON.

While the Roman Catholic Council of Trent in 1546 affirmed the canonicity of all the disputed books of the New Testament, the Reformation may be regarded as denoting the beginning of the great critical activity, which during more than three centuries has steadily modified the judgment of Christendom respecting the authorship, date, and authenticity of a large number of the writings composing the canon. While the Church of the Reformation intensified the doctrine of inspiration, and made the Bible rather than the ecclesiastical tradition the sole source of authority, and while it left the canon in form substantially inclusive of all the previously disputed writings, some of its leaders assumed an attitude of subjective criticism of certain books, which practically amounted to their rejection.

Luther maintained the right of individual judgment as to which of all the New Testament books are the best. He regarded the fourth Gospel and the Epistles of Paul as constituting "the right kernel and marrow" of all the books, because they contain little of the wonder-workings of Christ; but "sketch in a masterly way how faith in Christ overcomes sin, death, and hell, and gives life, righteousness, and salvation." Since the fourth Gospel, in contrast with the other three, records the words rather than the works of Jesus, it is "the only, tender, right chief-Gospel," and is greatly to be preferred to the others. Paul's Epistles, especially that to the Romans, and the first Epistle of Peter are far superior to the synoptic Gospels.

Luther regarded Hebrews as inferior to the other Epistles ascribed to Paul, because the writer had built, though upon the right ground, with "wood, hay, and stubble," and James he could not tolerate, because it ran directly counter to Paul's doctrine of justification by faith. To him it was "a right strawy Epistle," destitute of "evangelical quality." He would not have it in his Bible, at least not among "the

right chief-books." It is evident that his point of view is dogmatic rather than critical. "My mind," he says, "cannot fit itself to the book, and it is to me reason enough why I do not hold it in high regard, that Christ is not taught or known in it." "I stand by the books that represent Christ to me bright and clear." As to Revelation, he regarded it as "neither apostolic nor prophetic." The position given to Hebrews, James, Jude, and the Revelation at the end of the Lutheran Bible has been regarded as indicating that these books were in the judgment of the reformer "disputed."

Zwingli rejected Revelation, and Calvin thought that Hebrews was not written by Paul, and that 2 Peter was not the work of the apostle Peter. The Arminian, Hugo Grotius, not only entered upon a critical consideration of the synoptic problem in endeavouring to determine the relation of Mark to Matthew, and of Luke to Matthew and Mark, but also contested the Pauline authorship of Hebrews, and cast suspicion upon the genuineness of 2 Peter and 2 and 3 John.

XIV.—CRITICISM AND THE CANON.

Criticism denotes no new departure in its relation to the canon. It only affirms the right of all Christians to assume the attitude toward the New Testament books that the primitive Church assumed, and that was again taken up by Luther—that of the right and necessity of judging each separate book as to its claims to be accounted a representative of apostolic Christianity. Text-criticism having approximately established the original text, it is the task of the higher criticism to determine, as far as possible, the authorship of the various writings (genuineness), the relation of the first three Gospels to one another (the synoptic problem), the date or time of composition of the different books with reference to the attitude that they assume toward the ideas and tendencies of certain historical periods, and the

relations existing among all of them as regards the development and progress of religious thought during the two or three generations within which they arose. Its procedure is historical, so far as it treats the writings as historical productions that grew out of certain conditions, and were influenced by an environment more or less known. Literary the procedure also is, inasmuch as it deals with the books as literary productions, and subjects them to an examination as a peculiar and well-defined literature.

From these points of view criticism can entertain no presumptions regarding the inspiration of the writings in question in the sense that they are infallible or inerrant in matters of history, biography, or doctrine. A certain inspiration may as a matter of fact be accorded to their writers in the degree to which they were affected by the influence that proceeded from Jesus and the great spiritual awakening that he promoted. But the inspiration of a writer is not to criticism a criterion of the canonicity of his writing; neither is the fact that the author of a Christian book was an "apostolical man" such a criterion. Indeed, from the point of view of criticism, the conception of canonicity has undergone a radical change inwardly, while outwardly the traditional-historical idea of it is maintained.

Criticism recognises the New Testament, as we now have it, as the historical canonical New Testament, without regard to the apostolical authorship of its several books or to the inerrancy of their writers. It interprets each of its writings historically as a literary phenomenon of its time and as holding a relation near to or remote from the original teaching of Jesus. From the point of view of the critical school, strictly so called, the first three Gospels stand closest to the genuine tradition of Jesus, though no one of them was written by an apostle, while the fourth Gospel is a speculative, ideal construction of his life and teachings, representing a later development of religious thought.

The only incontestably genuine Epistles are Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philipians, and 1 Thessalonians ; so that if apostolical authorship were a criterion of canonicity, the canon of the New Testament would be composed of these alone. But they represent little of the original teaching of Jesus, being an independent construction of a doctrine of salvation foreign to the essential teaching of the Master. The remaining Epistles represent a progressive development of religious thought, particularly in the direction of an enhancing of the Christological conception, and of the various practical and ecclesiastical points of view of the time when the Church was striving to solve the momentous problems of unity and catholicity in the conflict with heresy and in the reconciling of opposite tendencies in its own household.

The attitude of criticism toward the canon, then, denotes a return to the point of view of the primitive Church at the time when the question of canonicity was receiving serious consideration — an attitude that was discriminative of the difference in worth of different books, and with which was consistent the recognition of disputed writings side by side with the undisputed as having an importance to be determined by the judgment and the Christian consciousness of the Church. Criticism does not attempt to overthrow the canon of the New Testament, but its aim is to determine the value of each book composing it with relation to the only real Christianity, the teaching of Jesus, and to assign it its place in the development of religious thought that had its beginning in his wonderful personality.

THE END.

GOSPEL-CRITICISM AND HISTORICAL CHRISTIANITY

A Study of the Gospels and of the History of the Gospel-Canon during the Second Century; together with a Consideration of the Results of Modern Criticism. Second Edition, 8vo, gilt top, pp. xiii-365, \$1.75.

CHIEF CONTENTS.—I. THE TEXT—II. THE CANON—III. THE SYNOPSIS PROBLEM—IV. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MARK—V. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW—VI. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO LUKE—VII. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO JOHN—VIII. THE ESCHATOLOGY OF THE GOSPELS—IX. DOGMATIC “TENDENCIES” IN THE GOSPELS—X. THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE GOSPELS; OR, THE HERMENEUTICS OF THE EVANGELISTS—XI. THE GOSPELS AS HISTORIES—XII. CRITICISM AND HISTORICAL CHRISTIANITY.

“A strong book, and well worth reading by any one who knows or does not know the recent results of the higher criticism.”—*Christian Union*.

“The work of a scholar who has made himself familiar with the most important recent investigations, and who appreciates the nature and bearing of the questions at issue. Replete with information for those who have not made the subject a specialty, and executed in a spirit of candor and rational inquiry.”—GEO. B. STEVENS, *Professor of New-Testament Criticism in Yale University, in Yale Review*.

“It is not excelled in attractiveness by any work that has been written on the subject.”—PROF. C. H. TOY.

“I admire its careful learning and thorough mastery of the subject, and more I admire the singular mental poise which it exhibits. Such a book marks an era in American scholarship.”—R. HEBER NEWTON, D.D.

“A thoroughly scholarly work; its tone is deeply reverent and spiritual, and its literary style is marked by sobriety and conspicuous refinement and grace. It has commanded throughout our close attention and frequent admiration.”—*The London Literary World*.

“I feel very great admiration for the scholarship and wisdom shown in the treatment of the whole subject. The book is admirable and cannot fail to do great good among thinking men.”—ANDREW D. WHITE.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, NEW YORK AND LONDON.

FOR SALE BY ALL BOOKSELLERS.

[OVER]

THE GOSPEL AND ITS EARLIEST INTERPRETATIONS

A Study of the Teaching of Jesus and its Doctrinal Transformations in the New Testament. 8vo, gilt top, pp. viii-413, \$1.75.

CHIEF CONTENTS. — INTRODUCTION, THE HISTORICAL AND CRITICAL TREATMENT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT—I. THE TEACHING OF JESUS—II. THE JEWISH-CHRISTIAN INTERPRETATION—III. THE PAULINE TRANSFORMATION—IV. THE DEUTERO-PAULINE INTERPRETATIONS—V. THE JOHANNINE TRANSFORMATION—VI. ANTI-GNOSTIC INTERPRETATIONS—VII. JEWISH-CHRISTIAN APOCALYPTIC—VIII. THE GOSPEL AND THEOLOGY.

The object of this work is to elucidate the teaching of Jesus and to present both in their relation to it and to one another the principal types of religious doctrine contained in the New Testament.

“The scholarship, skill, and spiritual insight and sympathy evinced, have created a picture of the teaching of Jesus and of the Pauline, Johannine, and other transformations and interpretations of it which, I believe, is unique in our language, and which will be welcomed and appreciated by all who are interested in the supreme question of our age.”—J. G. SCHURMAN, *President of Cornell University*.

“An admirable sketch of the vicissitudes of Christian doctrine within the limits of the canonical writings.”—DR. C. H. TOY, *of Harvard University*.

“Rev. Dr. Cone’s second volume in the field where he is so erudite a scholar, so candid a thinker, and so lucid a writer, will confirm the high position at once accorded him by discerning readers of his work on *Gospel-Criticism and Historical Christianity*.”—*The Literary World*.

“Handles the subject with perfect candor, learning, and skill, yet not without the caution and reverence that belong to every phase of biblical exegesis.”—*The National Baptist*.

G. P. PUTNAM’S SONS, NEW YORK AND LONDON.

FOR SALE BY ALL BOOKSELLERS.

[OVER]

By W. M. RAMSAY.

THE CHURCH IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE BEFORE A.D. 170.

With Maps and Illustrations, 8vo \$3.00

"It is a book of very exceptional value, Prof. Ramsay is a real scholar and of the very best type of scholarship. A thoroughly good book; a product of first-hand and accurate scholarship; in the highest degree suggestive; and not only valuable in its results, but an admirable example of the true method of research."
—*The Churchman*.

ST. PAUL THE TRAVELLER AND THE ROMAN CITIZEN.

With Map, 8vo \$3.00

"A work which marks an important step in advance in the historical interpretation of St. Paul. . . . It is an immense gain to have the narrative lifted from the mean function of being an artful monument and mirror of a strife internal to Christianity which it seeks by a process, now of creation, now of elimination, to overcome and to conceal, to the high purpose of representing the religion as it began within the Empire and as it actually was to the Empire and the Empire to it. . . . Professor Ramsay has made a solid and valuable contribution to the interpretation of the Apostolic literature and of the Apostolic age—a contribution distinguished no less by ripe scholarship, independent judgment, keen vision, and easy mastery of material, than by freshness of thought, boldness of combination, and striking originality of view."—*The Speaker*.

IMPRESSIONS OF TURKEY DURING TWELVE YEARS' WANDERINGS.

8vo \$1.75

"No conception of the real status of Turkey is possible unless something is understood of 'the interlacing and alternation of the separate and unblending races.' . . . Such an understanding is admirably presented in Prof. Ramsay's book, which gives a near and trustworthy insight into actual Turkish conditions."—*N. Y. Times*.

WAS CHRIST BORN AT BETHLEHEM?

A Study in the Credibility of St. Luke. Part I. The Importance of the Problem. Part II. The Solution of the Problem. 8vo, \$1.75

"The work is one of which students of biblical criticism will need to take account. It is absolutely candid and straightforward, thorough and discriminating, and courteous to other scholars whose conclusions it sees most reason to condemn. It is a fine piece of work."—*The Congregationalist*.

HISTORICAL COMMENTARY UPON THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

8vo \$3.00

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, NEW YORK AND LONDON.

PAUL, THE MAN, THE MISSIONARY, AND THE TEACHER

BY ORELLO CONE, D.D.

Cloth, gilt top, \$2.00

CHIEF CONTENTS—PART I. THE MAN: 1. FORMATIVE INFLUENCES; 2. PERSONAL TRAITS; 3. THE CONVERSION. PART II. THE MISSIONARY: 1. THE FIRST YEARS—GALATIA AND THE GALATIAN EPISTLE; 2. PHILIPPI, THESSALONICA, CORINTH; 3. EPHESUS—ROME; 4. THE PAUL OF THE ACTS AND THE PAUL OF THE EPISTLES. PART III. THE TEACHER: 1. THE LAW; 2. "LIFE," "DEATH," AND "SALVATION;" 3. DOCTRINE OF SIN; 4. SALVATION—ATONEMENT; 5. PERSON OF CHRIST; 6. SUPERNATURALISM; 7. FAITH AND JUSTIFICATION; 8. ETHICS; 9. PREDESTINATION; 10. THE CHURCH AND THE SACRAMENTS; 11. ESCHATOLOGY.

"An exposition of Paul as he was."

—DR. THOS. R. SLICER in *The New World*.

"Among the many treatises on Paulinism published of recent years, this book takes a high place. In the present writer's judgment **it surpasses all others written in English in acumen and vigor.** A special merit of the presentation of Paul's ideas **is the fulness and lucidity** with which the subtle and mystical elements of his thought are stated. Dr. Cone's style has a sinewy vigor which makes his book easy reading throughout."

—PROF. E. Y. HINCKS of Andover in *The Church*.

"As **an exhaustive and luminous** account of the life and work of Paul as a missionary to the gentiles and as a teacher, it stands unrivalled. Part III is a masterly exposition of the apostle's thought which leaves nothing to be desired."—*The Aberdeen Journal*.

"Biblical scholarship in America has not produced a more creditable work than this."—*The Christian Register*.

"**A standard work** will for a long time constitute the point of departure for all studies of Paul that are to be taken seriously."

—PROF. H. HOLTZMANN, *University of Strassburg*.

PUBLISHED BY

THE MACMILLAN CO., New York
A. & C. BLACK, London

